

Maj. Gen. Harry Hawkins Vaughan (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew Frank McIntyre (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Benjamin Franklin Riter, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve, Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf (lieutenant colonel, Infantry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

HONORARY RESERVE

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Carlton Spencer Dargusch (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Col. John Thomas Taylor, Chemical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman John C. Shannon (Naval Academy) to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947:

Charles R. Mischke

Charles B. Teal

Jerry W. Bates (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

Robert C. Doeringhaus

William E. Nims

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 25, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art ever drawing us to Thyself with the gentle compulsions of Thy spirit, may this moment of prayer lead us into the fellowship of nobler aspirations and endeavors.

Inspire us with a faith that has larger realizations of divine wisdom and power and wider applications to the problems of these days which are so full of changes, confusions, and conflicts.

May the nations of the earth and the members of the human family be mindful of one another, and in their common remembrance may they bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; and

H. R. 4268. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 176. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes;

S. 342. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

S. 722. An act to authorize the issuance of Oregon Trail commemorative 50-cent pieces to the Oregon Trail Monument Association, Idaho Unit, Inc.;

S. 1042. An act to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin;

S. 1064. Relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service;

S. 1116. To provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes;

S. 1543. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended;

S. 1614. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine;

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners;

S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.; and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a copy of a letter which I have sent to my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska on the accomplishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"That this Act may be cited as the 'National Security Act of 1947'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Sec. 2. Declaration of policy.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"Sec. 101. National Security Council.

"Sec. 102. Central Intelligence Agency.

"Sec. 103. National Security Resources Board.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"Sec. 201. National Military Establishment.

"Sec. 202. Secretary of Defense.

"Sec. 203. Military Assistants to the Secretary.

"Sec. 204. Civilian personnel.

"Sec. 205. Department of the Army.

"Sec. 206. Department of the Navy.

"Sec. 207. Department of the Air Force.

"Sec. 208. United States Air Force.

"Sec. 209. Effective date of transfers.

"Sec. 210. War Council.

"Sec. 211. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"Sec. 212. Joint staff.

"Sec. 213. Munitions Board.

"Sec. 214. Research and Development Board.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 301. Compensation of Secretaries.

"Sec. 302. Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.

"Sec. 303. Advisory committees and personnel.

"Sec. 304. Status of transferred civilian personnel.

"Sec. 305. Saving provisions.

"Sec. 306. Transfer of funds.

"Sec. 307. Authorization for appropriations.

"Sec. 308. Definitions.

"Sec. 309. Separability.

"Sec. 310. Effective date.

"Sec. 311. Succession to the Presidency.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"Sec. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"Sec. 101. (a) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Security Council (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Council').

"The President of the United States shall preside over meetings of the Council: *Provided*, That in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place.

"The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.

"The Council shall be composed of the President; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, appointed under section 202; the Secretary of the Army, referred to in section 205; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force, appointed under section 207; the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, appointed under section 103; and such of the following-named officers as the President may designate from time to time: The Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board appointed under section 213, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board appointed under section 214; but no such additional member shall be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council.

"(b) In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the policies and functions of the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the national security, it shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

"(1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

"(2) to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and

agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

"(c) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 a year. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the Council, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Council in connection with the performance of its functions.

"(d) The Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

"CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

"Sec. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year.

"(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then—

"(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director), with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and shall be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which \$14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Director of Central Intelligence may, in his discretion, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such

employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(d) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—

"(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

"(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

"(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpoena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;

"(4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

"(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

"(e) To the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination: *Provided, however*, That upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

"(f) Effective when the Director first appointed under subsection (a) has taken office—

"(1) the National Intelligence Authority (11 Fed. Reg. 1337, 1339, February 5, 1946) shall cease to exist; and

"(2) the personnel, property, and records of the Central Intelligence Group are transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency, and such Group shall cease to exist. Any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or authorized to be made available for such Group shall be available and shall be authorized to be made available in like manner for expenditure by the Agency.

"NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

"SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established a National Security Resources Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board') to be composed of the Chairman of the Board and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President to be members of the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice

and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year.

"(b) The Chairman of the Board, subject to the direction of the President, is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions.

"(c) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

"(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

"(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

"(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

"(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for, manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

"(5) policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves;

"(6) the strategic relocation of industries, services, government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

"(d) In performing its functions, the Board shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY

ESTABLISHMENT

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established the National Military Establishment, and the Secretary of Defense shall be the head thereof.

"(b) The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title II of this Act.

"SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 202. (a) There shall be a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national security. Under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this Act he shall perform the following duties:

"(1) Establish general policies and programs for the National Military Establishment and for all of the departments and agencies therein;

"(2) Exercise general direction, authority, and control over such departments and agencies;

"(3) Take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research;

"(4) Supervise and coordinate the preparation of the budget estimates of the departments and agencies comprising the National Military Establishment; formulate and

determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget; and supervise the budget programs of such departments and agencies under the applicable appropriation Act: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force from presenting to the President or to the Director of the Budget, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any report or recommendation relating to his department which he may deem necessary: *And provided further*, That the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force shall be administered as individual executive departments by their respective Secretaries and all powers and duties relating to such departments not specifically conferred upon the Secretary of Defense by this Act shall be retained by each of their respective Secretaries.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit annual written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the National Military Establishment, together with such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the National Military Establishment, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"MILITARY ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY

"SEC. 203. Officers of the armed services may be detailed to duty as assistants and personal aides to the Secretary of Defense, but he shall not establish a military staff.

"CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint from civilian life not to exceed three special assistants to advise and assist him in the performance of his duties. Each such special assistant shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 a year.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such other civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the National Military Establishment other than those of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"SEC. 205. (a) The Department of War shall hereafter be designated the Department of the Army, and the title of the Secretary of War shall be changed to Secretary of the Army. Changes shall be made in the titles of other officers and activities of the Department of the Army as the Secretary of the Army may determine.

"(b) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions relating to the Department of War or to any officer or activity whose title is changed under this section shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be deemed to relate to the Department of the Army within the National Military Establishment or to such officer or activity designated by his or its new title.

"(c) The term 'Department of the Army' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Army at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Army.

"(d) The Secretary of the Army shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Army, of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"(e) In general the United States Army, within the Department of the Army, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may

be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. It shall be responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY"

"Sec. 206. (a) The term 'Department of the Navy' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Navy at the seat of government; the headquarters, United States Marine Corps; the entire operating forces of the United States Navy, including naval aviation, and of the United States Marine Corps, including the reserve components of such forces; all field activities, headquarters, forces, bases, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Navy; and the United States Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy pursuant to law.

"(b) In general the United States Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall include naval combat and services forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It shall be responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping.

"The Navy shall develop aircraft, weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of naval combat and service elements; matters of joint concern as to these functions shall be coordinated between the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime com-

ponents of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE"

"Sec. 207. (a) Within the National Military Establishment there is hereby established an executive department to be known as the Department of the Air Force, and a Secretary of the Air Force, who shall be the head thereof. The Secretary of the Air Force shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of the Air Force and the provisions of so much of title IV of the Revised Statutes as now or hereafter amended as is not inconsistent with this Act shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force.

"(c) The term 'Department of the Air Force' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Air Force.

"(d) There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and two Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(e) The several officers of the Department of the Air Force shall perform such functions as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

"(f) So much of the functions of the Secretary of the Army and of the Department of the Army, including those of any officer of such Department, as are assigned to or under the control of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, or as are deemed by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary or desirable for the operations of the Department of the Air Force or the United States Air Force, shall be transferred to and vested in the Secretary of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That the National Guard Bureau shall, in addition to the functions and duties performed by it for the Department of the Army, be charged with similar functions and duties for the Department of the Air Force, and shall be the channel of communication between the Department of the Air Force and the several States on all matters pertaining to the Air National Guard: *And provided further*, That, in order to permit an orderly transfer, the Secretary of Defense may, during the transfer period hereinafter prescribed, direct that the Department of the Army shall continue for appropriate periods to exercise any of such functions, insofar as they relate to the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Air Force or their property and personnel. Such of the property, personnel, and records of the Department of the Army used in the exercise of functions transferred under this subsection as the Secretary of Defense shall determine shall be transferred or assigned to the Department of the Air Force.

"(g) The Secretary of the Air Force shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Air Force, of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"UNITED STATES AIR FORCE"

"Sec. 208. (a) The United States Air Force is hereby established under the Department of the Air Force. The Army Air Forces, the Air Corps, United States Army, and the General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), shall be transferred to the United States Air Force.

"(b) There shall be a Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years from among the officers of general rank who are assigned to or commissioned in the

United States Air Force. Under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall exercise command over the United States Air Force and shall be charged with the duty of carrying into execution all lawful orders and directions which may be transmitted to him. The functions of the Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), and of the Chief of the Air Corps and of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be transferred to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. When such transfer becomes effective, the offices of the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, and Assistants to the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, provided for by the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 768), and Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force, provided for by section 5 of the Act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1525), shall cease to exist. While holding office as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the incumbent shall hold a grade and receive allowances equivalent to those prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff, United States Army. The Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force shall take rank among themselves according to their relative dates of appointment as such, and shall each take rank above all other officers on the active list of the Army, Navy, and Air Force: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall have the effect of changing the relative rank of the present Chief of Staff, United States Army, and the present Chief of Naval Operations.

"(c) All commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, commissioned, holding warrants, or enlisted, in the Air Corps, United States Army, or the Army Air Forces, shall be transferred in branch to the United States Air Force. All other commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, who are commissioned, hold warrants, or are enlisted, in any component of the Army of the United States and who are under the authority or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued under the authority or command of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force. Personnel whose status is affected by this subsection shall retain their existing commissions, warrants, or enlisted status in existing components of the armed forces unless otherwise altered or terminated in accordance with existing law; and they shall not be deemed to have been appointed to a new or different office or grade, or to have vacated their permanent or temporary appointments in an existing component of the armed forces, solely by virtue of any change in status under this subsection. No such change in status shall alter or prejudice the status of any individual so assigned, so as to deprive him of any right, benefit, or privilege to which he may be entitled under existing law.

"(d) Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of the Air Force, all property, records, installations, agencies, activities, projects, and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued to the same extent under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command, respectively, of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, in the Department of the Air Force.

"(e) For a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, personnel (both military and civilian), property, records, installations, agencies, activities, and projects may be transferred between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

"(f) In general the United States Air Force shall include aviation forces both combat and service not otherwise assigned. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily

for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations. The Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TRANSFERS

"Sec. 209. Each transfer, assignment, or change in status under section 207 or section 208 shall take effect upon such date or dates as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"WAR COUNCIL

"Sec. 210. There shall be within the National Military Establishment a War Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The War Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces, and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

"Sec. 211. (a) There is hereby established within the National Military Establishment the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; and the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, if there be one.

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, it shall be the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to prepare strategic plans and to provide for the strategic direction of the military forces;

"(2) to prepare joint logistic plans and to assign to the military services logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

"(3) to establish unified commands in strategic areas when such unified commands are in the interest of national security;

"(4) to formulate policies for joint training of the military forces;

"(5) to formulate policies for coordinating the education of members of the military forces;

"(6) to review major material and personnel requirements of the military forces, in accordance with strategic and logistic plans; and

"(7) to provide United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

"(c) The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense and shall perform such other duties as the President and the Secretary of Defense may direct or as may be prescribed by law.

"JOINT STAFF

"Sec. 212. There shall be, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Joint Staff to consist of not to exceed one hundred officers and to be composed of approximately equal numbers of officers from each of the three armed services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Director shall be an officer junior in grade to all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"MUNITIONS BOARD

"Sec. 213. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Munitions Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments, to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Board under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and in support of strategic and logistic plans prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to coordinate the appropriate activities within the National Military Establishment with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the departments and agencies comprising the Establishment;

"(2) to plan for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

"(3) to recommend assignment of procurement responsibilities among the several military services and to plan for standardization of specifications and for the greatest practicable allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and common use items on the basis of single procurement;

"(4) to prepare estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

"(5) to determine relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

"(6) to supervise such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

"(7) to make recommendations to regroup, combine, or dissolve existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

"(8) to maintain liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and to make recommendations as to policies in connection therewith;

"(9) to assemble and review material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and those presented by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense; and

"(10) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(d) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Munitions Board.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

"Sec. 214. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board').

The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and two representatives from each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to be designated by the Secretaries of their respective Departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year. The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of

Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Board, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense—

"(1) to prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

"(2) to advise with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

"(3) to recommend measures of coordination of research and development among the military departments, and allocation among them of responsibilities for specific programs of joint interest;

"(4) to formulate policy for the National Military Establishment in connection with research and development matters involving agencies outside the National Military Establishment;

"(5) to consider the interaction of research and development and strategy, and to advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith; and

"(6) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(c) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Research and Development Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Research and Development Board.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

"Sec. 301. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"UNDER SECRETARIES AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

"Sec. 302. The Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 a year and shall perform such duties as the Secretaries of their respective departments may prescribe.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND PERSONNEL

"Sec. 303. (a) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized to appoint such advisory committees and to employ, consistent with other provisions of this act, such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out their respective functions and the functions of agencies under their control. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation while serving as members of such committees shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$35 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

"(b) Service of an individual as a member of any such advisory committee, or in any other part-time capacity for a department or agency hereunder, shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the

act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves a department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested.

"STATUS OF TRANSFERRED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL"

"Sec. 304. All transfers of civilian personnel under this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, but the head of any department or agency to which such a transfer is made is authorized to make such changes in the titles and designations and prescribe such changes in the duties of such personnel commensurate with their classification as he may deem necessary and appropriate.

"SAVING PROVISIONS"

"Sec. 305. (a) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions applicable with respect to any function, activity, personnel, property, records, or other thing transferred under this Act, or with respect to any officer, department, or agency, from which such transfer is made, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, terminated, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer had not been made; but, after any such transfer, any such law, order, regulation, or other action which vested functions in or otherwise related to any officer, department, or agency from which such transfer was made shall, insofar as applicable with respect to the function, activity, personnel, property, records or other thing transferred and to the extent not inconsistent with other provisions of this Act, be deemed to have vested such function in or relate to the officer, department, or agency to which the transfer was made.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any transfer or change in title under the provisions of this Act; and, in the case of any such transfer, such suit, action, or other proceeding may be maintained by or against the successor of such head or other officer under the transfer, but only if the court shall allow the same to be maintained on motion or supplemental petition filed within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain settlement of the questions involved.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of the second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the existing organization of the War Department under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9082 of February 28, 1942, as modified by Executive Order Numbered 9722 of May 13, 1946, and the existing organization of the Department of the Navy under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9635 of September 29, 1945, including the assignment of functions to organizational units within the War and Navy Departments, may, to the extent determined by the Secretary of Defense, continue in force for two years following the date of enactment of this Act except to the extent modified by the provisions of this Act or under the authority of law.

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS"

"Sec. 306. All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by or on behalf of the Army Air Forces or officers thereof, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Such other unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, non-

appropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by the Department of War or the Department of the Army in exercise of functions transferred to the Department of the Air Force under this Act, as the Secretary of Defense shall determine, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Unexpended balances transferred under this section may be used for the purposes for which the appropriations, allocations, or other funds were originally made available, or for new expenditures occasioned by the enactment of this Act. The transfers herein authorized may be made with or without warrant action as may be appropriate from time to time from any appropriation covered by this section to any other such appropriation or to such new accounts established on the books of the Treasury as may be determined to be necessary to carry into effect provisions of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS"

"Sec. 307. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

"DEFINITIONS"

"Sec. 308. (a) As used in this Act, the term 'function' includes functions, powers, and duties.

"(b) As used in this Act, the term 'budget program' refers to recommendations as to the apportionment, to the allocation and to the review of allotments of appropriated funds.

"SEPARABILITY"

"Sec. 309. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE"

"Sec. 310. (a) The first sentence of section 202 (a) and sections 1, 2, 307, 308, 309, and 310 shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this Act shall take effect on whichever of the following days is the earlier: The day after the day upon which the Secretary of Defense first appointed takes office, or the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY"

"Sec. 311. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President', approved July 18, 1947, is amended by striking out 'Secretary of War' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Defense', and by striking out 'Secretary of the Navy.'

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
CHET HOLIFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The bill as agreed to in conference is the same as the House amendment, except for typographical, clerical, and clarifying changes, and the following:

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided (sec. 101 (a)) that the National Security Council be composed of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense (in the Senate bill designated as "Secretary of National Security"), the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Under the Senate bill the Council was also to be composed of such other members as the President may designate from time to time. Under the bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 101 (a)) the Council, in addition to the members specifically named above, is to be composed of such of the following-named officers as the President may designate from time to time: the Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board. No such additional member is to be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council. Thus, for example, the Secretary of Commerce now in office could be designated by the President as a member of the Council, but if in the future a new Secretary of Commerce is appointed the new Secretary could not serve as a member of the Council until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office of Secretary of Commerce.

The Senate bill (sec. 101 (c)) provided that the Secretary of Defense be director of the staff of the Council. The House amendment (sec. 101 (c)) provided that the Council have a staff headed by a civilian executive secretary to receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 101 (c)) is the same as the House amendment except the compensation of the executive secretary is fixed at the rate of \$10,000 a year.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The Senate bill provided that the Director of Central Intelligence be appointed from the armed services or from civilian life. The House amendment provided that the Director of Central Intelligence be appointed from civilian life. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 102) provides that the Director shall be appointed from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life

and adds a new subsection (b) which provides that if a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then (1) in the performance of his duties as Director, he is to be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and (2) he is not to possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing. Except as noted in the preceding sentence the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services and his acceptance of and service in such office is in no way to affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Also any such commissioned officer, while serving in the office of Director, is to receive the military pay and allowance (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and is to be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Central Intelligence Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which \$14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

The House amendment (sec. 105 (d)) provided that to the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence operations of the departments of government as relate to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination. Section 102 (d) of the bill as agreed to in conference provides that to the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security, shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination; provided, however, that upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

PERSONNEL OF NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Both the Senate bill (sec. 103 (b)) and the House amendment (sec. 106 (b)) authorized the chairman of the National Security Resources Board to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions. The Senate bill provided that such authority be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The House amendment provided that

such authority be without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 103 (b)) follows the language of the Senate bill.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Both the Senate bill (sec. 202 (a)) and House amendment (sec. 102 (a)) provided that the new Secretary be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The House amendment contained a proviso (not contained in the Senate bill) providing that a person who has held a commission in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a)) contains a provision that a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense.

The Senate bill (sec. 202 (a) (2)) imposed upon the Secretary of Defense the duty to exercise general direction, authority, and control over certain departments and agencies. The House amendment (sec. 102 (a) (2)) added the word "general" before the word "authority" and before the word "control." The words added by the House amendment have been deleted in the bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a) (2)) as surplusage.

The Senate bill (sec. 202 (a) (3)) imposed upon the Secretary of Defense the duty to formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget. The House amendment contained no such provision. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a) (4)) contains this provision from the Senate bill.

COMPOSITION AND DUTIES OF THE NAVY AND OF NAVAL AVIATION

The House amendment (sec. 203 (b)) contained language relating specifically to the composition and duties of the United States Navy and of Naval Aviation. The Senate bill (sec. 206 (b)) provided that the provisions of this act shall not authorize the alteration or diminution of the existing relative status of Naval Aviation. The first and last paragraphs of section 206 (b) of the bill as agreed to in conference are the same as the first and last paragraphs of section 203 (b) of the House amendment. The second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 203 (b) of the House amendment are omitted and the following is inserted in lieu thereof:

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping."

COMPOSITION AND DUTIES OF THE MARINE CORPS

The House amendment (sec. 203) contained the following provision:

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The primary mission of the Marine Corps shall be to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution

of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition to its primary mission, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the performance of the primary mission hereinbefore set forth. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war."

The Senate bill (sec. 206 (b)) provided that the provisions of this act shall not authorize the alteration or diminution of the existing relative status of the Marine Corps (including the Fleet Marine Forces). The bill as agreed to in conference contains the same language (sec. 206 (c)) as that in the House amendment except that (1) the words "The primary mission of the Marine Corps shall be" at the beginning of the second sentence are changed to read "The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped"; (2) the words "to its primary mission" at the beginning of the fourth sentence are omitted; and (3) the words "performance of the primary mission hereinbefore set forth" in the proviso at the end of the fourth sentence are omitted and in lieu thereof the words "operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized" are inserted.

COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

The Senate bill (sec. 302 (b)) provided that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive the compensation prescribed for the Secretary of Defense. The House amendment (sec. 301 (b)) provided that these three Secretaries shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$14,500 a year. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 301 (b)) provides that these three Secretaries shall each receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
CHET HOLIFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Barden	Hall,	Norton
Bell	Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Bland	Harness, Ind.	Pfelfer
Bloom	Hart	Phillips
Buckley	Hartley	Phillips, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Hays	Poulson
Butler	Hébert	Powell
Cannon	Heffernan	Rabin
Carroll	Hendricks	Rayfield
Case, S. Dak.	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Jenison	Rooney
Chelf	Jenkins, Pa.	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sadowski
Clements	Jones, N. C.	Sarbacher
Cole, Mo.	Jones, Wash.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Somers
Cox	Kefauver	Stigler
Dawson, Ill.	Kelley	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Kennedy	Thomason
Dingell	Keogh	Tollefson
Dumengeaux	Klein	Trimble
Durham	Lesinski	Vail
Elsasser	Ludlow	Vinson
Fellows	Lynch	Welch
Fernandez	McCowan	Williams
Fuller	McDowell	Wood
Gathings	Macy	Worley
Gifford	Marcantonio	Youngblood
Gore	Mason	Zimmerman
Gossett	Meade, Md.	
Gregory	Norrell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 340 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request at this time. Perhaps later in the day the Chair may be able to, but not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that during the time of adjournment the vacation of Congress, so-called, which is always to the individual Members a period of extra work and overtime, you all will have a pleasant time with the folks at home.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which is H. R. 4214, under the number S. 758, to my mind, is as important as any that could come before the Congress. There is no question but that we need unification. All admit that in all preparations for national defense or for war there has been inexcusable duplication and waste. War is waste and destruction.

My reluctance to vote for legislation of this kind grows not out of the fact that it is not needed but that for some 25 years certain individuals connected with the Joint Staff have been seeking not only to give the Nation unity in its preparations for defense and for war and greater efficiency, but that some of those pushing it seek to open the door to the establishment of a military dictatorship. Not only does the General Staff want to give us greater efficiency but as indicated by the terms of this bill they want the power to plan our domestic as well as our foreign policy. When you read the bill you will discover that that is the fact. All too often these planners become the ones with authority and carry out their plans as distinguished from the plans of the Congress.

XCVIII—643

And so there may arise in your minds the question as to why I support it, and I can only repeat what I said in the beginning when this bill was before us for the first time. It is the lesser of two evils. Apparently we are going to pass—I may say it is evident we are going to pass—some legislation on this subject, and may I respectfully submit to you and to your judgment that the bill that your committee brought back, the bill just returned by the conferees to this House, is a great improvement over the original bill, and the best we can get at this time. That is why the conferees bring it back for your consideration.

In this bill you will find provisions that make it necessary that future Congresses will be required, if our liberty is to be preserved, to guard against the planning of the State Department and the military in this country with reference to foreign policies, with reference to domestic economy, with reference to the dissipation of our resources and our production, our industrial plants, because, as we all know, in these days the planning is more than half the battle; and when they bring planned or planning legislation here to Congress—when it relates to foreign policy or domestic policy the Congress has been all too willing, for what reason I know not, to accept, adopt, and carry it out.

Now to touch the provisions of this bill, the points on which your conferees could not carry out your wishes to the extent which they desired. Distinguished gentlemen from the other end of the Capitol had something to say about it. They had quite a lot to say about it.

You will recall that when the House passed on this legislation it amended the bill H. R. 4214, which the committee reported, with reference to the Central Intelligence Agency. The committee had written into the bill a provision that the head of that agency might be a civilian or a man from the armed services. The House amended the bill to provide that he shall be a civilian. During the debate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] offered an amendment which provided that if a man from the armed services was appointed he should be required to relinquish his rank and his authority in the Army.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when we went into conference, the conferees for the other body flatly refused to accept that amendment. They had made certain concessions to which your attention will be called later on, but on that one they stood pat. They refused to accept the House amendment to the committee bill so your conferees compromised by accepting the language of the bill, 4214, as reported by your committee to the House, thus discarding the amendment written into the bill by the House which would have required that the head of that agency be a civilian. My own choice, and I think the choice of six of the seven members of the House subcommittee who were conferees, was that the head of that agency should be a ci-

vilian, but we could not get it, so we went along with that compromise. It seeks to divorce the head of the agency from the armed services if a man in the service is appointed.

It will be recalled also, if you have read the hearings, that there was a deliberate effort on the part of the Army part of the Joint Staff to reduce the marines to the status of a police force. Your committee, and the House sustained its action, wrote into the bill certain provisions which protect the marines. You may just as well talk about stopping the sunrise or the setting of the sun as to think that the people of this country are going to permit the Congress to vote to get rid of the marines. The marines have fought their way into the hearts of all the people, and the conferees who were opposed to the provisions which protected them could get nowhere. In my humble judgment, this bill protects to the fullest extent the marines, their activities, their role, their missions, their rights to develop the kind of warfare and weapons they think are necessary or of advantage to the country.

There was fear on the part of some who had been in the Navy as to certain omissions in the original bill as sent up by the administration. You will recall that the men who fought as admirals, vice admirals, rear admirals, men who fought in the last war as captains, and officers of lower rank, some of them having had their ships blown out from under them, did not get an opportunity to appear before the committee to express their thoughts and their ideas as to what the legislation should be. You will recall that 4 or 5 days before the hearings were ended, and they were closed in spite of my protest, there were two orders of the Navy, 94 and 95, which prevented the fighting men and officers in the Navy, except as their views were channeled through the Secretary of the Navy from expressing their opinions. That gag was only removed a few days before the hearing ended. It was then impossible to call those witnesses. So there was a justifiable fear on the part of the enlisted men in the Navy and on the part of the officers of the Navy that an attempt was being made to take from them naval aviation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Cole] offered an amendment in the House, and it was adopted, which in our opinion and apparently in the opinion of the Members of the House protected the Navy by permitting it to continue to have naval aviation.

We had to make some changes in the phraseology of that amendment as written in by the House. But again, in my judgment, there is no change in the basic thought; there is no change in the language that will prevent the Navy from carrying out to the fullest extent its desire to be adequately protected in time of war by naval aviation and to develop before war comes naval aviation.

Those were the three more important points in the legislation as it went to conference. First was the appointment of the head of the Central Intelligence. We had to guard against a gestapo, and we wrote in there a provision which we

think now will do that. Then there was the protection to be given to the marines and there was the protection to be given to naval aviation. We have both in the bill as it comes back from conference. So, on the whole, if we must have a bill—and we must—it is here. We do most humbly and respectfully submit this bill for your consideration and action. My only purpose in calling attention to the dangers the bill carries is this: It opens the door to military dictatorship and renders more burdensome the duty of future Congresses to adequately protect us from government by the armed services. All in all, inasmuch as the Congress is determined to pass a bill, this is the best we can get, and it is if the powers granted are not extended and if the organizations set up by it are content to remain within the written provisions of the bill, not too bad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed by the continued generosity of my distinguished chairman. My friend the gentleman from Michigan has referred to the Director of Central Intelligence, and I think I might advise the House that that was the last question that we passed upon in conference. The Senate accepted the House provision of the bill as reported out of the House committee.

You will remember when the bill was on the floor we frankly advised the Committee of the Whole at that time that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was strongly inclined toward, if not favorable to, a civilian director, but in view of the immediate situation that confronted us we put in the provision that in case a military man, a career officer of the Army or the Navy, was appointed that he would have to occupy what would be, in effect, a civilian position. We tried to protect him so that he would be free from a dual influence. I recognize, if one were to argue or say it did not completely eliminate a dual influence, that I could not challenge that statement. But we did the best we could from a human angle. We felt, since enabling legislation was going to come in later from another standing committee of the House—and we know that; we were advised and saw a copy of the proposed bill—that that question, with the other questions that would arise in connection with this Central Intelligence Agency, should be left to the standing committee, and that our committee should try to meet the immediate problem. The bill as it comes back is substantially the House bill. I think it is a much better bill—and I agree on that with my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—than any of the bills that were considered by the committees of both branches and an improvement upon the bill that passed the Senate. It is now a bill that probably expresses in the most effective way possible the collective action to a satisfied extent of the membership of the House and the Senate.

This bill is one of the most controversial problems that came up in Con-

gress at the outset of this session, and we have seen it go through the House practically without any opposition. The House is now ready to accept the conference report. I think this is a strong indication of the confidence the House has in the considerations of the House committee and in the bill the House committee reported.

One of the most controversial problems and consequently one of the last to be resolved was the question of providing in legislation a reasonable assurance that the Marine Corps and naval aviation would continue to perform their proper functions in the National Military Establishment after unification. Fears were expressed, and honest fears, that an attempt to describe in detail the composition of forces, and their functions and missions might introduce an inflexibility which would impair the effectiveness of the armed forces.

Your committee recognized these fears, and while they considered it desirable to provide in general terms for the continued functioning of these two elements of the armed services, it was not their intent to create a statutory rigidity which would be a bar to future progress. By the same token, it is not their intent by this act to freeze the organization of the armed forces, or the concept of military operations, since a major purpose of the act is to assure that scientific progress shall be reflected in a progressive and dynamic organization. It is in no way the intent of the committee to tie the hands of the Secretary of Defense in any manner which would prevent the increased economies and the enhanced efficiency which the people of the United States have a right to expect. Further, nothing in this act should be construed as infringing upon the traditional and constitutional authority of the President as Commander in Chief.

The bill permits broad flexibility in administration and in operation in all of its aspects, and should be construed in the future from that angle. Under no conditions, either directly or indirectly, even if we had the power to do so, does it infringe upon or invade the powers of the President, as President or as Commander in Chief. This is clearly the intent of the Congress.

We have now come to the final legislative stage in this very important and far-reaching piece of legislation. It shows what the processes of legislative action under constitutional government are. As we look back through the months we recollect the fears that were expressed, and some properly so, then we recollect the evidence considered in hearings and the fears taken into account. Then the bill went through the legislative processes, and has finally come down to this final legislative stage, and we now find a feeling of abiding satisfaction that the bill represents the best that can be done at this time in connection with legislation along the lines outlined therein.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I concur in what the gentleman has said. As the gentleman

knows, I personally think it is a mistake not to require that the Director of Central Intelligence be a civilian, but I am sure that on the whole the bill is in excellent shape and that the majority of the provisions for which the House committee voted and which it believes to be right have been written into the bill. I think the committee is to be congratulated.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I think the House can accept the statement of the chairman, in which I concur, that the conferees on the part of the House are able to report back to the House that the substance of the changes made by the House committee are contained in the bill.

It has been a pleasure to me to work with all of the members of the committee on this bill. Every Member approached this problem with an open mind, no matter what party he belongs to. The members of the conference committee, both of the House and of the Senate, did likewise. There were no difficulties at any time. We went into the thing very carefully. It is a bill which through able and courageous administration will produce efficiency and economy in our armed services, and will make stronger our future national security.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the Department of State. Because of my long-time respect and admiration for Gen. George C. Marshall, the Secretary of State, this is indeed a grievous thing to have to do.

However, under circumstances outlined to me in great detail with respect to State Department action—or, I should say, lack of action—on behalf of an American citizen, I think it is apparent that there is no other recourse than to have the matter in question fully investigated. I am confident that every Member of Congress who familiarizes himself with the problem will agree as to the validity of my decision.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, calls for investigation of the State Department's action with reference to the rights of an American citizen to protection under the provisions of the arbitration treaty between our Nation and the Government of Guatemala. This treaty requires the submission to arbitration of claims of American citizens against the Government of Guatemala. The individual in question—a man by the name of Soto—has been refused such arbitration by the State Department. I can see no valid

reason for it; I am advised that there are reasons therefor, but reasons which will not stand up under investigation.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this man's claim has been pending since 1929—all of this time in the State Department. It has been twice approved by the Legal Department of the State Department. Moreover, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate passed a resolution declaring that this American citizen is entitled to arbitration under the treaty in question. The State Department's failure to act has been questioned by myself and Senators WILEY, BUTLER, and JENNER, and, as I have stated before, in effect has been questioned by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Nothing has come of it. It is, I submit, time to act.

Now, let me say here that I do not know Mr. Soto. The results of the matter do not bear upon me personally in any respect, politically or otherwise. I am totally disinterested in the problem from any standpoint other than the obtaining of redress for an American citizen who, from all available facts, is certainly entitled thereto. I further submit that it is the duty of the Congress to exert its power for the protection of the rights of our citizens. And if it appears—as it definitely does—that the legal department of the State Department is so engrossed in other matters that it not only neglects but refuses to maintain and protect the rights of our own citizens, at a time when we are being called upon to assist the plight of foreign nationals, then, I say, Mr. Speaker, that something effective must be done.

For this reason, I have offered a resolution today to require a thoroughgoing investigation of this claim, not only in fairness to this American citizen by the name of Soto, but because of the possibility, if this matter has been grossly mishandled, of similar action having been taken in other instances involving our own citizens. I earnestly request that whichever committee of the House of Representatives receives my resolution will follow the matter to its conclusion. I am personally confident that an investigation is fully warranted. It should get under way with the least possible delay.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

Resolved, That the Committee on _____, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the action of the Department of State with respect to the claim of George B. Soto, a native-born American citizen, against the Government of Guatemala, amounting to approximately \$3,000,000, which has been pending in the Department of State since 1929; to ascertain why the agreement made by Guatemala with the Department of State to arbitrate this claim in 1932 was not carried out by the Department of State; to ascertain why, when the claim was approved as valid and meritorious by the legal department and the counselor of the Department of State in 1938 and 1940, and dispatches sent to Guatemala demanding settlement of the claim in June 1941, such claim should by October 1941 become not valid and not meritorious and be dropped by the Department of State after Guatemala had made two offers of cash payments of the

claim, thereby admitting liability under the claim; to ascertain whether or not the dropping of the Soto claim by the Department of State was involved in the securing of the cooperation of Guatemala in the Presidential freezing order issued in July 1941, and before Guatemala was at war with Germany and Japan; to ascertain the liability of the United States Government for the payment of this claim if the claim has been used by the Government for its own purposes, and, if so, to provide for payment of the claim out of Department of State appropriations, if, by the failure of the Department of State to act, the liability has been fixed by the Department of State on the United States Government; to ascertain and determine whether the legal rights of an American citizen under the Pecuniary Claims Convention of Buenos Aires of 1910 to arbitration of the claim can be denied by the Department of State.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) within 120 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, dispatches, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I make another appeal for action by this House on legislation that is urgently needed for the veterans before Congress adjourns. I have urged especially that action be

taken before adjournment on pending legislation, already approved by the Senate, to increase subsistence allowances to students under the GI bill. I again earnestly request that the majority leadership give favorable consideration to that.

In the extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation recently the authority to purchase GI loan paper was left out over the protest and votes of many of us and I think that experience has shown, and will show, that this was a mistake. I note the Senate has just passed a bill to give such authority to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation again. Legislation is pending in this House to do the same. I earnestly appeal to the majority leadership not to adjourn this Congress until that legislation is also passed.

There are other items of veterans' legislation pending which I do not have time to discuss in the time given me but which I hope the leadership will give consideration to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the extension exceeds the amount allowed and will cost \$177.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by Dr. Thorning, and in another instance to include an article appearing in the American Watch Worker.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

Mr. FOLGER and Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article in the Republican News of July 1947.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a paper on reparations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include letters and a clipping.

Mr. CELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Spyros P. Skouras.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. It may slightly exceed the cost as prescribed, but I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding that fact I may be granted that permission.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the additional cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the other special orders today, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to entertain such a request at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Are we not allowed to talk about the Kansas City investigation?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman can get time he can talk about anything he wants to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to entertain requests for 1-minute speeches at this time.

MANUFACTURERS OF WAR MATERIALS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to conduct a study and review of the activities of those manufacturers of war materials during World War II who materially contributed to the war effort of the United States and her allies. The committee would also recommend that a suitable form of recognition, comparable to citations awarded to members of the armed services, be awarded to manufacturers for the valuable services they performed to this country and our allies. As a result of investigations conducted by either congressional committees or private citizens, too many of these loyal citizens who did such a remarkable job in helping us to win this war are now being criticized for political or other reasons. Many innocent people are being accused of having made exorbitant profits or having produced inferior matériel, which is not based on the facts. No one can deny that without the valuable aid given by the majority of manufacturers of war matériel we might not have won the war, or at least it might have been prolonged. Scientists and others who perfected the atomic bomb and manufacturers of ships, tanks, munitions, and other types of war matériel should be commended by some public recognition for the great service they rendered to their country. It is the purpose of my resolution to create a committee which would go into this whole field and report to the Congress giving the names of the outstanding manufacturers who would be commended in some form recommended by the committee.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the joint resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 8843,

and no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN.

Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER CAPEHART,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
JOHN BRICKER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
BURNET R. MAYBANK.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate joint resolution authorized the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to continue to exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 until December 31, 1947, with the proviso that no such regulations should fix a maximum maturity of installment credit of less than 24 months or require a down payment in excess of 20 percent of the purchase price. It further provided that except during any war beginning after December 31, 1947, or any national emergency proclaimed by the President after such date, no such consumer credit controls should be exercised after such date.

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate joint resolution after the enacting clause and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute providing that after the date of enactment of the joint resolution the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 and, except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of the joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of the joint resolution, no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised hereafter.

The substitute agreed to in conference provides that after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843, and that no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

The House recedes from its amendment to the title.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN.

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the Senate re-

ceded with an amendment, the amendment being that the language of the House bill is accepted in its entirety except that the effective date is November 1, 1947, instead of the date of the enactment of the resolution.

The only difference is that consumer credit controls under the conference agreement will be continued to November 1, 1947, instead of the date of the enactment of the resolution as provided in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the conferees. I think it is a very happy solution of the disagreements existing between the two Houses.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 2. The United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of section 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947)

operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants."

And the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOE MCCARTHY,
J. WM. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The first section of the Senate bill added a new subsection (6) to section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 providing in part that notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (5) or of any other section of such act the Authority is authorized to make capital grants, loans, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing or slum-clearance projects, in the full amount of any sums previously allocated, to any public housing agency, at the request of such agency, upon condition that such agency will pay, or cause to be paid, by the State or political subdivision, the difference between the cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) and the actual cost of construction per family dwelling unit or per room during the period of building construction. The House amendment modified this provision so as to provide that the amount to be so paid, or caused to be paid, should be such proportion of the total development cost of the project as the amount of the average actual cost per family dwelling unit of the items covered by the applicable cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) in excess thereof bears to such average actual cost; and a proviso was added to the effect that the amount of any such payment should be excluded from the base on which the maximum amount of any capital grants, loans, or annual contributions authorized by such act are calculated. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment added to the bill a section 2 which inserted at the end of the second sentence of section 2 (1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 a proviso prohibiting the Federal Public Housing Authority and all officers and employees thereof, during the period from the time of taking effect of the proviso until February 29, 1948, (1) from initiating or maintaining any action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such Authority, if such action or proceeding is based upon the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allow-

able maximum, and (2) from in any manner requiring any State or local public housing agency to take any action to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such agency, if the basis for requiring the State or local public housing agency to take such action is the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, unless other adequate housing facilities are available for said occupants. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The committee of conference have agreed upon a substitute for the House section which provides that the United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of sec. 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947) operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the only matter in controversy before the conferees was the provision in respect to the eviction of tenants in public housing projects. The conference agreed to certain changes which amount to about the same thing as provided in the House bill except that there is some discretion on the part of the Administrator in respect to ousters.

At the present time there are many tenants of the public housing projects who are not eligible as tenants because their income is higher than that allowed by statute. During the war they were not evicting any of these families, of course.

Under the basic law the Administrator is compelled to evict tenants who become ineligible for occupancy because of an increase in income. This amendment is to somewhat soften those practices, but at the same time makes it possible for persons of low income who are intended to be tenants to eventually occupy the projects. For that reason, and notwithstanding the provisions of basic law, we have given the Administrator the authority to evict them unless he finds that there are no facilities for them and unless he finds that undue hardship would result from the ouster. In other words, we authorize the eviction but only when there are facilities to which the people may move.

Mr. Speaker, the report is signed by all the managers on the part of the House and I think it is a very sensible compromise between the Senate and House positions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report is an improvement on the

bill as passed by the House and I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. The discretion then rests with the local Housing Authority, the local administering authority, is that the fact?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; in substance that is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. This discretion continues until March 1, 1948, only?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KEAN. It gives them 6 months.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it seems this is entirely inconsistent with the whole philosophy of Government housing, which is to clean out slums and to protect and help the low-income group. The result is to ignore the basic philosophy, is it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would not say it ignores the basic philosophy, because the tenants are paying an economic rent. These people of high income are not paying the low rent, they are paying an economic rent, but we have a condition here whereby during the war these people were literally frozen into these projects. We could not move them, because of lack of facilities, and we have not whipped the housing shortage yet. Now, we hope to do so by March 1 of next year, when we hope it will be perfectly safe for all of the high-income people to be moved from these projects to make room for the people of low income. That program will be gradually carried out so that there will not be too much of a shock or inconvenience to the individuals affected. Instead of ousting them all immediately, we provide for their eviction according to a well-defined program between now and March 1.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 5 minutes. I think I may in a minute or two suggest what I believe is a very good step in getting some brick laid, so far as housing is concerned. It is furthermore a good step, because it is not a completely Federal controlled project. For the first time now in some of these slum clearing housing projects we are encouraging the municipalities to come in and provide funds, and I am very proud of the fact that the city of Milwaukee has taken the lead in itself providing funds to activate this slum clearance program. I believe a number of other cities that have projects of slum clearance similarly planned will follow suit. It is an excellent example of Federal, municipal, and local cooperation on a slum clearance project, and in that respect I think it is a concrete step forward in getting some housing now when housing is sorely needed in the larger cities.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman that it is necessary to clean up some of the slums in the cities. There is no more important place than right here in Washington. Is there anything in this bill that contemplates that it be done immediately before we get these houses built for veterans?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. No; there is nothing there that will interfere with the homes for veterans whatsoever. These are all projects that have been planned. Contracts have been let, and they have not been able to proceed because the law as it now stands does not permit them to go ahead on account of the ceiling fixed by the law. This conference bill permits the municipality to provide that excess amount that is necessary in view of the rising cost to proceed with the project.

Mr. RICH. At the time they think best, or are they to go at this immediately?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. At the time they think best, but of course, they all fill an important immediate need.

Mr. RICH. We grant the need, but they still have a place to live, whereas in the case of the ex-servicemen, they do not have any place, and they want to take care of them first and then go ahead with these slum clearances.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about that; that the veterans are in great need of a housing program, and everything should be done to provide veteran housing now. This bill demonstrates the use of Federal and municipal help on levels where it should be done, in slum clearance and pertaining to low income groups.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman, in the final analysis, if this so-called housing shortage has not got to be solved by the desire on the part of the people to build homes for themselves?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is exactly right, and primarily by the desire and the activity of the people in their respective localities, and this bill points in that direction. It points toward the activity on the part of local communities and engages them where formerly they were not.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not have reference to local home ownership. I want the individual to own the house, and if we will get him to encourage that desire, then we will not be confronted by the kind of emergencies we had up for discussion the other day as the result of the housing outfit not selling these houses to established individuals.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made an excellent suggestion, because it is the individual who must take the first step ordinarily, to build his own home, because we know of his great anxiety in that regard.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is it not a fact that we find many veterans in these so-called slum clearance projects, and this measure will provide decent houses for veterans who are unfortunately living in slums today?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is exactly true. It will help those veterans likewise. The city of Milwaukee, Wis., has taken the lead in the Nation to activate this slum clearance program that will affect many cities throughout our country. Milwaukee takes this lead in housing as she has in so many other ways, in crime prevention, in safety, in the health and welfare of its citizens. The reason for this is because the people of Milwaukee have a strong spirit of independence of mind, initiative and sense of public responsibility. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROPHY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and myself have supported this legislation. Officials of the city of Milwaukee like Assistant City Attorney John Decker have worked hard and earnestly to secure its passage. This legislation deserves the support of every Member of this House because it shows a healthy trend toward State and Federal cooperation in the clearance of slums from our urban centers. This is not a fantastic scheme. It is making it possible by the help of the municipalities to start excavating, laying foundation and brick and putting roofs over the heads of people who would otherwise be living in the hovels of urban slums.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOBLECK].

Mr. SCOBLECK. Mr. Speaker, the approval of the proposed amendment to the United States National Housing Act of 1937 is incumbent upon us, for it provides the means for additional housing in this Nation at a time when homes are most needed; when we have funds appropriated that are being tied up because of the increased costs of construction; when we have expended large sums for the beginning of housing projects, which remain dormant; when the solution of these problems can be met with the adoption of this amendment.

I urge the adoption of this amendment and base my decision on a situation of which I am personally informed. There are many housing projects which were sponsored under the United States National Housing Act of 1937 that are incompletable throughout the Nation. In the city of Scranton, Pa., which is located in my district, there was begun before World War II a project known as Valley View Terrace. This project was initiated under the Housing Act of 1937. Over \$300,000 of Government funds have been invested in its construction; there remains appropriated and unexpended almost \$700,000 of United States funds for its completion.

In the meantime, what was described at the passage of the act as a crisis in housing in the Nation has now increased to larger proportions.

The virtual suspension of repairs and building in home construction for the past 7 years has extended the housing

crisis to a highly acute and almost shameful situation. World War II veterans, who have returned from round the world, anticipating a normal life, with the necessities of life and a few luxuries available to them in this land of ours, have found themselves without independent shelters to set up housekeeping with the wives they left behind, or the sweethearts they came home to and married.

In the instance of Valley View Terrace at Scranton, there is partial construction of a development that will provide, when completed 240 homes. This, of course, will not solve the housing shortage in this area by any means, but it will indeed be of great help and reduce by 240 families, those who are seeking independent shelters.

The United States Government has a huge investment in Valley View Terrace as it has in many other similar projects. It is poor economy to let such invested funds rot on the ground; it is poor government that does not lead the way to relieve discomfort and inconveniences that have resolved upon its men and women who fought in defense of their country.

This amendment will pave the way for the completion of these projects, and without the appropriation of additional United States Government funds.

With building costs having risen higher and beyond original estimates, this amendment provides the respective housing authorities that have been set up for the construction and operation of these projects to take measures to finance any additional costs that have developed because of higher construction costs.

In the instance of Valley View Terrace, I am informed that the Scranton housing authority, once provision is made, is prepared to finance the costs that will accrue above and beyond the appropriated funds.

With authority, vested in them by this amendment, to provide the wherewithal for the completion of Valley View Terrace, I respectfully urge the Members of Congress to pass this amendment and take a long step in the solution of the housing problem in Scranton and throughout the Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 317) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiry to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture, or subcommittees thereof, as authorized by H. Res. 298, not to exceed \$50,000, including expenditures for the employment of attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contin-

gent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$25,000."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have about 15 resolutions from the Committee on House Administration. They are all privileged; they are all unanimously reported, I think, and they all explain themselves.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

FASCISM IN ACTION

Mr. PATMAN. I am getting many inquiries about the publication of the booklet on Fascism in Action. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the committee expects to report out the resolution which would permit the printing of 100,000 additional copies for distribution by the Members? Under the present situation each Member will get only one copy. Naturally more requests than that will be received. In order to supply these requests, under the present situation the Members will be compelled to purchase these documents from the Government Printing Office, and I am advised they will cost 40 cents per copy. I am hopeful that the gentleman's committee will report out the resolution to allow a reasonable number, at least, to be printed for distribution by the Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Subcommittee on Printing took up the gentleman's resolution for the printing of 100,000 copies of Fascism in Action but had no estimate of the cost and took no action on that resolution at this time. The full committee will probably not be in session again during this session.

Mr. PATMAN. I have found out how much it would cost. It would cost \$91.50 per thousand if printed when the Government Printing Office supply is printed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We have had enough hand-outs to Members of Congress, and we do not want any more books at 40 cents a copy to be given them for nothing. If the Members want more than their allotment, they ought to pay for them.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution will be before the committee at the next session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. McGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUCK, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 303) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 141, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 259) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$30,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 331) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 295, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$125,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 332) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$125,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this provides for the expenses of the select committee which was provided for in the resolution adopted by the House 2 days ago.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Is that the resolution known as the Herter resolution?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think it is known as the Herter resolution.

Mr. SABATH. That will investigate conditions covered by the resolution that we just passed for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The resolution with reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs is entirely separate and apart from the so-called Herter resolution.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether any evidence has been given before your committees as to whether these two committees will not really overlap.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Their activities will not overlap, I am advised.

One committee is appointed to look into the political conditions in Europe and around the world perhaps, and the other committee will more likely direct its investigations to economic conditions.

Mr. SABATH. Has that committee already been appointed?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think that the Speaker in his wisdom has not yet appointed that committee, but I am not advised as to that at the moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the members of the committee have not yet been selected.

Mr. SABATH. I trust that the Speaker in his wisdom will appoint a committee that will not be lopsided and which will give the minority adequate representation. The resolution did not provide for that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have supreme confidence in the Speaker that he will see there is a fair distribution of the appointees and that able men and women are selected for that investigation.

Mr. SABATH. This cost \$125,000?

Mr. LECOMPTE. And that is considerably less than the committee asked for.

Mr. SABATH. The other resolution called for \$125,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Considerably less than they asked for.

Mr. SABATH. The three resolutions that we passed before called for \$25,000, \$30,000, and \$50,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has several other resolutions to provide for these committees?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have.

Mr. SABATH. How much will all of these investigations that are provided for, that you are going to ask appropriations for, amount to? Can the gentleman give the House the figure?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I can give you all the figures. Do you want the figures for the whole session or just today?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman has those figures, I think it would be useful to the Members. Otherwise, overstatements and misstatements may be made. So that if we have the actual amounts that have been appropriated, I think it will serve the membership well to explain that it is not over two or three mil-

lion, as some people have stated. I, myself, thought it would be under a million dollars.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It will be right at a million dollars.

Mr. SABATH. But I believe I was close to the figures even before these resolutions were reported. I think we will appreciate it if the gentleman will give the figures for the cost of all these investigations.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We have authorized investigations to the amount of \$632,204.03 up to this morning. There are approximately \$400,000 worth of authorizations or approvals in this morning's list of resolutions, which makes it around \$1,000,000, but considerably less than the total amount of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SABATH. But will the gentleman state that it will be over a million dollars?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Just a trifle over a million dollars, but very little of that money is expended yet.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is there anything in any of these investigations that will investigate the crookedness of this last election at Kansas City; to find out just exactly what is going on out there? They are trying to block every investigation. I think we ought to have something to let the American people know just how crooked that election was, and the American people deserve to know what it was.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman can offer a resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. How many resolutions of inquiry emanated from the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Only one.

Mr. CELLER. Was there one previous to the one the gentleman just spoke of?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No, sir; not for investigation.

Mr. CELLER. I wondered whether or not there are enough members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct all these tours.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Well, one is for a select committee and one is for the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, the Speaker will name the members of the select committee.

Mr. CELLER. Has the gentleman examined the history of the Reorganization Act and its purposes? Was not the Reorganization Act to discourage so many members on junkets, I might call them?

Mr. LECOMPTE. These resolutions have been approved by the House.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not a fact that the committee was very conservative in its consideration of the requests of the various committees in perhaps approving only about 50 percent of those requests?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Only about 50 percent of the requests; the gentleman is correct on that.

Mr. BURLESON. I believe the gentleman will agree that it is hardly the prerogative and responsibility of the

Committee on House Administration to go behind the scenes of various committees and determine whether or not the investigations are necessary.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Emphatically so.

Mr. BURLESON. The Committee on House Administration cannot anticipate all of the actions of the investigating committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The House approved the resolution providing for the investigation and then requests come to this committee for the money to cover their expenses. Their request is scrutinized carefully and in many cases cut down 50 percent.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. As a Member of the House who is violently opposed to some of these foreign policies, I believe it is high time the Committee on Foreign Relations informed itself, and I believe this expenditure is one of the wisest that could be granted by the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 238, to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, COOPER, and MILLS.

TERMINATING CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS BEFORE THE END OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, COOPER, and MILLS.

EXTENDING SECOND-CLASS MAIL PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN STATE AGENCIES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or depart-

ments, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. REES, TWYMAN, and LYLE.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (1) (h) INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 333) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to publicity and propaganda in the Government departments and agencies authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$10,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (1) (h) INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 334) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$15,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 111

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 335) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 111, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed \$25,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This committee had \$50,000 before and have expended that \$50,000, is that correct?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Forty thousand dollars, not all expended.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not all expended?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now we are appropriating for them \$25,000 more?

Mr. LECOMPTE. They have extensive investigations in mind and they also have a number of requests for investigation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. For instance, I understand they are talking about a trip out to Hollywood, is that right?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, can justify this expenditure for the gentleman very easily.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it ought to be justified to the Congress.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I may say for the benefit of the House that this committee was granted \$40,000 of which it has spent about \$15,000, leaving about \$25,000. We are going to be in recess for at least 5 months. Certain investigations have been asked by the public. The committee has made its plan and in order to follow out the program for the next 5 months and not run out of funds, the Committee on Accounts cut them from an original budget of \$75,000 down to an additional \$25,000, merely to carry on for the 5 months during adjournment of the Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to point out one thing that I think is very significant. As I understand it, this committee is to go out to Hollywood and make an investigation along the same lines and of the same nature another committee of the House made. The Committee on Un-American Activities went out to investigate labor in Hollywood. The Committee on Un-American

Activities did practically the same thing and made investigations along the same line. Some of these investigations, in my opinion, do nothing more nor less than add fuel to the building up of scare headlines in order to develop hysteria against labor in this country.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the House has authorized these investigations. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURES FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 264 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Document Numbered 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, entitled "Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States", and "Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States", prepared by the Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, be printed in one volume with an index as a House document; and that five thousand additional copies shall be printed, of which three thousand copies shall be for the use of the House document room and two thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendments and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1), Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments acting as a whole, not to exceed \$5,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman of the said committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,500."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? May I have 5 minutes? Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, may I yield 5 minutes to a Member without losing control of the time, and yielding the floor?

The SPEAKER. If debate is desired?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes. I will not lose control of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Under those circumstances, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Reorganization bill came into effect, among the committees authorized by the law there was the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee was supposed to be the over-all investigating committee. Some of the papers characterized it as the Blue Ribbon Investigating Committee. They said great things would come out of that committee. People had great expectations that that committee would really accomplish something worthwhile. To it the leadership assigned six members of the Rules Committee.

On the 3d day of January, I offered an amendment to the act which would have given every standing committee of the House \$10,000, just the same as was granted to the committees of the Senate for general use and expenses. That was voted down, and we were told that our committee on expenditures would be given funds to make whatever investigations were necessary. When other committees asked for money to investigate various matters that I thought fell within the jurisdiction of that committee—and I am sure did rest within the jurisdiction of that committee—we made no objection; we let them go ahead. We were glad to get rid of part of the work, because we knew we would have more than we were able to do. Then there was created a Subcommittee To Investigate Surplus War Property. That committee was given, I think, \$50,000. It was a continuation of the old Slaughter committee. The committee has done a remarkably efficient and worth-while job. As I read the report and review the testimony taken, it shows where they have saved, by preventing certain activities, several million dollars. There can be no question but that every cent spent by that committee was justified.

Then we had another subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], a committee on propaganda that it was charged was illegal. That committee was given the modest sum of \$26,000. One reading the reports of that committee is convinced, cannot help but be convinced, that so much of that money as was spent was spent ju-

diciously. That committee did a remarkable job. A great saving will come from the activities of that committee, and it is barely possible that some in the Government service may find themselves behind the prison bars. I most respectfully ask the Members of the House to read the reports of that committee.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I would like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that of the \$26,000 given to the committee of which I am chairman, less than \$5,000 thus far has been spent in the two investigations we have made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A most remarkable record; a most remarkable record. And the Members of the House, who know of the investigation and the activities of that committee, are confident that not one cent will be wasted, and that the Government will be saved many, many dollars because of the activities of that committee. Then there was another committee headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], whose activities have not yet ceased. Every member of that committee has been and is on the job and so are the members of the staff. So, there were three committees. There was another committee which took the place of the old Smith committee investigating extra legal activities. That committee of which I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee was given, I think, \$40,000 and, as the record shows, I think it has on hand at this time some \$38,000.

That committee did a job on racketeering by so-called unions and union men who had seized and improperly used union organizations. If the Department of Justice does its duty, some racketeers and extortionists will land in Federal penitentiaries.

The committee to investigate the State Department, headed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] was given \$10,000, and only a small portion of that has been expended. That committee has been very cautious in spending the Government's money and to get a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of that committee.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The subcommittee investigating the State Department has made use of a staff member and the facilities afforded by the committee, and not a penny of that \$10,000 has been spent up to this moment. We have been able to do this work without spending any of this money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman who is chairman of the subcommittee investigating the State Department now advises me that not one cent of the appropriation has been spent, that they have been using the committee staff. The report filed yesterday shows that the committee knows what is needed and has in no way failed to give worthwhile service.

Then we have the committee which investigated the Dock Street strike situa-

tion and that turned up cases showing violations of the law. We have been asking, besieging, begging, the Attorney General's department to prosecute and put behind the bars at least some of those offenders. So far we have gotten nowhere.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. **LECOMPTE**. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. **HOFFMAN**. There are many, many requests for investigations coming in which do not fall within the jurisdiction of any of these subcommittees.

I never was a spender nor a waster, nor, so far as I know, is any member of our committee inclined to waste money.

Within the past 15 days there was a conference of Governors held at Salt Lake City, Utah. One of the subjects of the conference was to determine how to get the most out of funds which were appropriated jointly by the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government to carry on work in which all were interested.

We were told that the Senate was sending a committee out to attend the conference. As chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I was asked to name a committee to attend the sessions of the convention, at which I am advised all but two of the Governors were present. And so a member of the committee and a secretary were sent to the governors' conference.

They returned with a full, complete, and instructive report, and the total expense to the committee was \$39.96, plus \$42.

The representatives of the committee hitchhiked rides on Government planes both ways. They charged for, and only for, their actual disbursements.

I cite this to show the Members of the House that our committee is not wasting Government funds; that it is performing its duty efficiently and economically. I cite it also as an illustration of what can be done, and done without great expense, if there is a real desire to serve the Federal Government.

A few weeks ago I asked for \$5,000 to be granted to the full committee to carry on its investigations, because we did not have one red penny to carry on those investigations called for by individuals and organizations throughout the country on matters which the chairman of that committee thinks ought to be investigated, but which will not fall within the jurisdiction of any of the subcommittees.

Early in the history of these committees I refused to sign vouchers for money spent under the direction of subcommittee chairmen, because I did not and could not know anything about what they were spending it for. I reached the logical conclusion, at least, I thought it was logical, that if a chairman of a standing committee appointed a chairman of a subcommittee, he ought to have confidence enough in the subcommittee chairman to let him spend his money the way he wanted it spent, and to sign vouchers for the money spent.

The other day when I asked for \$5,000 for the full committee, what did they do to me? They gave me \$1,500.

So if, during the remaining 5 months of the year, the Members of the House or their constituents write me demanding investigations of something that should be investigated, just please remember that the full committee—the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—the so-called blue-ribbon investigating committee of the House, the committee of the House which has on it six members of the great Rules Committee, has \$1,500—count them, \$1,500—to spend in conducting investigations.

The committee and its chairman will do their best, their utmost, to give you good service. But it will not get very far on the amount given it.

Please believe me when I say we will endeavor to be as careful of that precious \$1,500 as would the most efficient miser. While we are spending it, if we do spend it, we will refrain from looking with envy at those committees traveling abroad, at the spenders of the billions which are to be sent abroad.

In a lighter vein, permit me now to say to you gentlemen of the House that if there are any of you who have not been on a junketing expedition somewhere, or if you have a staff member who has not been on a junketing expedition somewhere, just let me know—and I am extending the same invitation to the Members of the other body, join us and help us avoid wasting any part of the money given us. File your request with me, so that perhaps you can get in and help me during the next 5 months save part of that \$1,500 which was so generously given our committee.

Mr. **LECOMPTE**. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan that his committee has already had for the five subcommittees \$196,000, and was permitted today \$25,000 more.

Mr. **SUNDSTROM**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **LECOMPTE**. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. **SUNDSTROM**. I might say that when the chairman of this committee says he will not be responsible for the vouchers of his subcommittees, he is the only committee chairman in the House that I know of that will not take that responsibility. The subcommittees of that committee have been granted over \$190,000. The Committee on House Administration did not feel that any committee should just be given a blank check to do as they pleased with it. We gave them \$1,500 so in case a necessity arose and some member of their staff had to take a trip throughout the country some day, they would have enough to pay his carfare.

Mr. **LECOMPTE**. I think that statement answers the charge of the gentleman from Michigan that this committee has not dealt fairly with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTRATION OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

Mr. **ENGEL** of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. **ENGEL** of Michigan, **CASE** of South Dakota, **TIBBOTT**, **SCRIVNER**, **KERR**, **MAHON**, and **NORRELL**.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. **LECOMPTE**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 297) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 293, by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of advisers, consultants, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. **LECOMPTE**. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the study of the tax question by the Ways and Means Committee is authorized by the House. The request for this small amount of funds was made jointly, I believe, by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman and ranking minority member of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on House Administration felt that this money would be prudently expended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. **FORAND**].

Mr. **FORAND**. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to extend my thanks to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration for the many courtesies that he has extended to me and also to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. **SUNDSTROM**], chairman of the subcommittee, who gave me an opportunity to appear before the committee, as well as to the other members of his committee for their graciousness. I appear before the House today with the thought in mind that a certain situation should be called to the attention of all the Members

before they cast their vote on this resolution. I want it understood at the outset that whatever I say should not be interpreted to reflect upon the character or reputation of any individual, but rather, that I am addressing my remarks to the principle involved and to certain practices to which I very seriously object.

I realize that whatever I say here will not prevent this resolution from being adopted or prevent \$25,000 being made available to the Committee on Ways and Means for the purpose of defraying certain expenses. But I do think that the membership of the House should be aware of the fact that this resolution is merely an act of charity to bail out the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for a mistake that he made in ignoring his committee and going out on his own speaking for the committee, yet without the authority of the committee, and appointing a so-called advisory committee made up of representatives of big business, Wall Street lawyers, and bankers, and others.

As I said before, I do not reflect upon their character, because if I were a professional man I, too, would be selling my services as they are doing. But the fact of the matter is that this committee is dominated by men who have appeared before our committee before and have expounded their views. Most of them have testified at the hearings recently held by our committee. So I see no good reason to have this so-called tax advisory committee using \$25,000 of the taxpayers' money to defray their expenses. We have their testimony. They have also appeared before the committee in previous years. The truth of the matter is, as I said before, we are simply going to bail out the chairman for having made an error, which he admitted in the committee recently and apologized to the committee at the time he was looking for some money to defray the expenses of this special group.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean to say that the committee has evidence that these men have submitted in the past; they have held hearings and you have their views on record now?

Mr. FORAND. The hearings are full of their statements.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. In the old days when we had witnesses come down we paid them \$6 a day and transportation. This resolution provides \$25,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FORAND. That is correct. And the chairman made a statement to the press that these men would not receive salaries but their expenses would be defrayed.

This group has come to Washington on two occasions, and therefore the expenses for those two trips now stare the committee in the face.

I believe that with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of experts on the committee, the staff of the Treasury, which is made available to us by the

Secretary of the Treasury, we have all the experts we need, so that the committee itself can write a bill, with the help of its own experts, and without having any outsiders come in and tell us how to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5 minutes now, and if he needs more time I may yield him more time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of House Resolution 297 is to provide the necessary funds for the activities of an illegitimate and hand-picked committee of outsiders appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means without prior consultation with or approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. No other purpose was suggested by the chairman of the committee for offering this resolution. This so-called Special Tax Study Committee was first announced by the chairman in a press release on June 8, 1947.

This Tax Study Committee of lawyers and businessmen, with one representative from organized labor, held its first meeting in Washington in the Ways and Means Committee room in the Capitol on June 12, 1947. At that time Mr. KNOTSON announced that "meetings of the special study group will be called by the chairman at such times and places as he may determine. The members of the special study group will serve without compensation, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in attending meetings of the study group called by the chairman. The expenses so incurred will be paid out of funds appropriated for the purposes mentioned on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means."

If I understand the foregoing statements of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, they authorize the chairman of the Special Tax Study Committee to call meetings wherever and whenever he may desire, with a blank check for all expenses incurred by the members in attending such meetings, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means promised to approve the vouchers for such expenses.

While this Tax Advisory Committee was meeting on June 12 the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and I took the House floor to call attention to the fact that the Special Tax Study Committee had never even been discussed in a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. Indeed it was not until July 15, more than a month later, that the chairman first mentioned his Special Tax Study Committee in a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. At that time he announced the introduction of House Resolution 293 and House Resolution 297 and requested authorization from the Committee on Ways and Means to proceed to obtain their enactment.

There are several reasons for my opposition to giving any official status to this outside advisory group:

First. The committee already has the able assistance of the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Mr. Colin F. Stam, and his expert staff; the Office of Tax Legislative Counsel and Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department; the technical and administrative people of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; and the staff of technical advisers recently added to assist the committee in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year. No necessity has been shown for any outside tax-study group.

Second. The committee has been holding hearings for nearly 2 months on the subject of a comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code. So every taxpayers' group represented among the membership of this committee has had an opportunity to come in and present their views on tax matters to the committee in open hearings.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. How much additional time does the gentleman want?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Three minutes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KNOTSON. The gentleman from Iowa can yield him my time, too.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That will not be necessary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Third. A comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code is not a part-time job to be entrusted to professional and business men already heavily loaded with personal responsibilities. It is a matter for continuous and painstaking study and draftsmanship by our tried and trusted tax specialists, including Mr. Beaman of the House legislative counsel.

Fourth. If an advisory committee is to be appointed, it should not be stacked with Members whose views on tax matters are so openly one-sided. Mr. Roswell Magill, the chairman of the special tax-study committee; Mr. John W. Hanes, and Mr. J. Cheever Cowdin, all are known to be spokesmen for big business and special interests in tax matters.

The appointment of the Magill committee was headlined in the New York Journal of Commerce on June 10, 1947, as follows:

Magill appointment underscores trend toward sales taxes.

The Wall Street Journal commented:

The emphasis in Congress is shifting from tax relief to tax-law revision, meaning redistribution of the tax burden.

And further:

Republican ideas are mirrored in the naming of Roswell Magill to head a Ways and Means Committee tax-study group. Mr. Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, has been chairman of the privately financed committee on postwar tax study. He supported GOP plans for a 20-percent tax cut across the board. His tax-study group recommends higher excises, and suggests the possibility of a 5-percent retail sales tax, along with other major revisions in the tax law that would immediately benefit stockholders, families with taxable incomes above the first surtax bracket, and businesses that encounter temporary financial hardships.

In conclusion, the Constitution vests the House of Representatives with exclusive power to originate revenue legislation. The House has delegated jurisdiction over tax measures to the Committee on Ways and Means. The people are entitled to the assurance that only their duly elected representatives, or properly selected professional employees of the Government, shall participate in the drafting of tax legislation. The taxing power so carefully restricted in the Constitution should not surreptitiously be delegated to, or subverted by, small groups representing their own selfish interests.

To bring men down from Wall Street to write the 1948 tax bill is in itself inexcusable. To pay the expenses of these men, some of whom come down in their own private airplane, is extravagant and wasteful, and an activity which an economy-minded House of Representatives ought not to sanction.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted me because I realize that the efforts of the opposition have proven a fizzle. I do want to say to the House, however, that the action of the chairman was ratified by a vote of 18 to 4 in the Ways and Means Committee and among those who voted to sustain the chairman was the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], former chairman, and a great chairman, of the Ways and Means Committee.

In appearing against the resolution before the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island started out with the usual balderdash about the Wall Street bankers. When he saw he was not getting anywhere with that attack he tried several other lines. I do not think I am divulging any confidences when I say that every member of the subcommittee voted to report this resolution out.

I have no desire to help the opponents of this resolution attain further political publicity.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would like to stress this fact: The gentleman and I have been on the Ways and Means Committee for 15 years and this is the first time our committee has asked for a dime out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; that is true. It is also the first time that some of the gentlemen have made the column of a certain columnist, a vehicle for personal aggrandizement. The information that the columnist was furnished by a member of our committee is greatly exaggerated and much of it is unfounded, but it made a pretty good story at that. I have never gone in for peanut stuff; I am too old in my services in the House to indulge in peanut politics now, and so far as I am concerned, the resolution may be acted upon at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it is important for the Members of this House to know that almost every single Member that has already been appointed to this Tax Study Committee was hand-picked by the chairman without even his own Members knowing anything about it, except that he had consulted with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] who gave him the name of one man out of 11 who was put on this committee. So, you know the type of committee that you are voting to legitimize today.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Minnesota are in agreement on this.

Like other committees of this House, we have our fair share of publicity seekers and demagogues.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to find myself in disagreement with my two colleagues the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], both of whom I know are able, diligent, and useful members of that committee. The purpose of the committee authorized by this resolution is not to reduce or to raise or to increase or lower taxes. It is a study for revision and a simplification of our present tax laws. That is the work the committee has in hand now, and it has been working on it for some time, and it is work that this special advisory committee was to advise the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to.

Now, this advisory group will not sit in with the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and Means writes tax legislation in executive session, based on such information and facts as it is able to gather, with the help of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury staff. Witnesses appear before it.

I do not believe politics should be mixed up with tax matters. I never did believe that, and while I was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means I will say that the minority members of that committee, with very slight exception, if any, went along with the majority members. We proposed many tax measures during the war. We wrote, perhaps, more tax laws, and proposed heavier taxes, than ever in the history of the country, and we worked along without any division of political lines.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I am sure the gentleman will agree that he consulted with every member of the committee. The committee was advised what he planned to do, and that he did nothing without consulting the committee, and for that reason he had the support and he still has the support and the respect of the Members, because he deserves it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. While I am not familiar with all the personnel of this committee, from what I know of them

by reputation, they are outstanding in their qualifications to advise the committee with respect to the revision of our tax laws. Dr. Magill was Under Secretary of the Treasury, selected by President Roosevelt, and I suppose approved by Secretary Morgenthau, for a year and 7½ months. He was adviser to our committee. I never heard a suggestion that he was partisan or that he was a Wall Street banker or anything of that kind. We all had confidence in him. He was able, and he was very helpful to us in his work. John Hanes, another member of this advisory committee, who during the Roosevelt administration was appointed I suppose with the approval of Secretary Morgenthau, as Assistant Secretary, and served in that capacity about 4 months, and then when Dr. Magill resigned he was promoted to Under Secretary and served as Under Secretary for a year and 2 months. I have never heard any criticism as far as his being partisan. He was able, he was outstanding. Another member of that committee was the present Governor of Kansas, Frank Carlson, who served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of years. He is able, he is nonpartisan as far as a man can be; fair minded in every respect. So far as I know the members of this committee are able and outstanding businessmen. The question of revision of our present tax laws is a job that we have been unable to do for a long time. Due to the press of work of our committee during the war we never had time to get to it. Now the Committee on Ways and Means is going to undertake this study under the direction of its able chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota. He says, and I have no reason to believe otherwise, that the work will be carried on in a nonpartisan way. The minority members will be consulted as well as the majority members. I am hopeful they will make a thorough study to assist the committee in simplifying our present tax laws so the ordinary taxpayer will not have to go to an expert accountant or lawyer and pay a big fee to get his tax returns made out. I think that with the help of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of the Treasury, and this advisory committee that has been appointed, we can do a good job in revising our present tax laws.

I am sorry that I find myself compelled to disagree with my colleagues. The chairman perhaps was a little premature when he first named the committee, but after his work was approved by the committee, as he has stated, by a vote of 18 to 4, I feel that the resolution should be adopted for the good of our committee and the work that we may be able to do for the Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated that as far as he knew the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had not consulted with anyone with the possible exception of our minority leader, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. For the information of the House, may I say

that the chairman came to me when he was considering appointing Wright Mathews, of Texas, and asked me if I knew him. I told him yes, I had the pleasure of knowing him, and I thought he was one of the most capable and one of the most outstanding tax lawyers in the United States. He was Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, appointed by President Roosevelt's administration, and rendered very efficient service in that position. It is true he is not a Wall Street banker, but I can assure the House that there is not a finer or more capable and honest man in the country than Wright Mathews. He will be an honor to the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted the gentleman has given the House this information. This is the first intimation I have had that any other person was consulted with the exception of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I know the majority members of the committee were not consulted before these selections were made, so the gentleman was getting special attention at the time the chairman of the committee consulted him.

Mr. WEST. You are getting an especially good man on the committee in Wright Mathews.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the gentleman. I assume Mr. Mathews is a fine expert.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say that of the committee of 11 that was appointed 6 are Democrats, 1 from Virginia, and my distinguished colleague can testify to his character and ability.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Lane, of Virginia, was appointed to this committee, as I understand. I have known Mr. Lane practically all of his life. He does not come from my district, but he is a Virginian. Mr. Lane came up the hard way. He worked himself up in the plant of which he now is the head. I think he is well qualified to pass on tax matters. He is a man who may be very helpful in the committee that has been appointed.

I also happen to know two other gentlemen of this committee, one being the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hanes. It has also been my privilege to know the former member of the committee who is now Governor of the State of Kansas, Mr. Frank Carlson. I compliment the gentleman on the type of men he has selected for this committee.

Mr. WEST. I join in that commendation.

May I say in conclusion that I think there is no finer character to be found anywhere than Wright Mathews.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lecompte. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 336), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective July 1, 1947, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation per annum, payable monthly, to certain employees of the House, so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

To the disbursing clerk the sum of \$1,000 basic.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

To the superintendent of the document room the sum of \$1,000 basic.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Lecompte. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I inquire as to the status of House Concurrent Resolution 31 which was favorably reported by the gentleman's committee on April 24?

Mr. Lecompte. We have a number of resolutions that we have not been able to get to yet. The gentleman's resolution is among them, and if we can get to it, it will be called up.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I just wanted to be assured that the gentleman is going to call up the resolution sometime. I have spoken to the majority leader, and he seems to be agreeable.

Mr. Lecompte. There are a good many resolutions that we have not been able to get to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED ELECTIONS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 337) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournment or recess of the Eightieth Congress, testimony and papers received by the Clerk of the House in any contested-election case shall be transmitted by the Clerk to the Speaker for reference to the Committee on House Administration in the same manner as though such adjournment or recess had not occurred: *Provided*, That any such testimony and papers referred by the Speaker shall be printed as House documents of the next succeeding session of the Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 338) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournments or recesses of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to con-

tinue its investigations in the contested-election cases of Mankin against Davis, Lowe against Davis, and Wilson against Granger. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES

Mr. Lecompte. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution resolution (H. Res. 339) to implement the resolution just passed and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 338, by the Committee on House Administration, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$5,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS MEMORIAL, GRANT PARK, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 112 to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the Marine Corps Memorial Commission, and to be composed of three Commissioners to be appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission shall consider and formulate plans for the erection upon a suitable site in Grant Park, in the city of Chicago, Ill., of an appropriate memorial to the members of the United States Marine Corps who have given their lives in the service of their country.

SEC. 2. The Commission may accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution; and is authorized to cooperate with interested public and private organizations in carrying out such functions.

SEC. 3. Upon the request of the Commission, the heads of the Federal departments or agencies may designate such personnel of their respective departments or agencies, or of the Marine Corps, as the case may be, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation except that their actual expenses in connection with the work of the Commission may be paid from any funds available for the purposes of this joint resolution, or acquired by other means herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The members of the Commission shall select one of their number as chairman and another as secretary.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall report its recommendations to Congress at the earliest practicable date.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript entitled "New Zealand Social Security Plan," notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the two-page limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$337.25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION—FREDERICK M. ROBERTS AGAINST HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered printed:

JULY 25, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: On December 4, 1946, Frederick M. Roberts served notice on HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, returned Member from the Fourteenth Congressional District of the State of California, of his purpose to contest the election of the said DOUGLAS and filed a copy of said notice in this office. Now comes the sitting Member, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, and in a communication filed with me July 24, 1947, moves to dismiss the contest, setting forth the reasons therefor.

For the information of the House, the Clerk deems it proper to state that no testimony on behalf of either party has been filed in his office as required and in the manner prescribed by law, and it would therefore appear that the contest had abated.

The notice of contest of Mr. Roberts and the motion to dismiss of the returned Member, together with a copy of the letter of her attorney, are submitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee.

Respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 340.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 36, Eightieth Congress, authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to continue certain investigations, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: The committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 27, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The authority granted by this resolution shall remain in force only until April 1, 1948: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, to grant waivers for the employment of alien seamen except for those who served between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, aboard vessels operated by the War Shipping Administration, the United States Maritime Commission, or the Army Transport Service."

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM L. CUNLIFFE

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 4177, for the relief of William L. Cunliffe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, William L. Cunliffe, of Montreal, Canada, who is of English descent, father of Bruce Ferguson Cunliffe, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to have been born in Canada rather than in India, where his parents were residing at the time the said William L. Cunliffe was born.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING IMMIGRATION ACT, 1917

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 1463, an act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States," approved February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 882; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 148), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. That upon the arrival of any alien, United States citizen, or national, by water at any port within the United States on the North American Continent from a foreign port or port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or at any port of the said insular possessions from any foreign port, from a port in the United States on the North American Continent, or from a port of another insular possession of the United States, it shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer, owners, or consignees of the steamer, sailing, or other vessel, having said alien, United States citizen, or national on board to deliver to the immigration officers at the port of arrival typewritten or printed lists or manifests made at the time and place of embarkation of such alien, United States citizen, or national on board such steamer or vessel, and such lists or manifests shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. That it shall further be the duty of the master or commanding officer of every vessel taking passengers from any port of the United States on the North American Continent to a foreign port or a port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or from any port of the said insular possessions to any foreign port, to a port of the United States on the North American Continent, or to a port of another insular possession of the United States to file with the immigration officials before departure a list of all aliens, United States citizens, or nationals, taken on board, said list to be in such form and to contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. No master or commanding officer of any such vessel shall be granted clearance papers for his vessel until he has deposited such list or lists with the immigration officials at the port of departure and made oath that they are full and complete as to the information required to be contained therein. Any neglect or omission to comply with the requirements of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 14 of this act: *Provided*, That in the case of vessels making regular trips to ports of the United States the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, may, when expedient, arrange for the delivery of lists of outgoing aliens, United States citizens, or nationals at a later date: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of immigration officials to record the following information regarding every resident alien and citizen or national leaving the United States by way of the Canadian or Mexican borders for permanent residence in a foreign country: Name, age, and sex; whether married or single; calling or occupation, whether able to read or write; nationality; country of birth; country of which citizen or subject; race; last permanent residence in the United States; intended future permanent residence; and time and port of last arrival in the

United States; and if a United States citizen, or national, the facts on which claim to that status is based."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940 AS AMENDED

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (n) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is amended, effective October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"SEC. 602. (n) Upon application by the insured and under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, payment of premiums on such insurance may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for 6 or more consecutive months, if such disability commenced (1) subsequent to the date of his application for insurance, (2) while the insurance was in force under premium-paying conditions, and (3) prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday: *Provided*, That upon application made within 1 year after the date of this enactment the Administrator shall grant waiver of any premium becoming due on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to the date of this enactment which may be waived under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That the Administrator, upon any application made subsequent to 1 year after the date of this enactment, shall not grant waiver of any premium becoming due more than 1 year prior to the receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the same, except as hereinafter provided. Any premiums paid for months during which waiver is effective shall be applied to payment of premiums subsequently becoming due on such insurance unless the insured requests a refund thereof. The Administrator shall provide by regulations for examination or reexamination of an insured claiming benefits under this subsection, and may deny benefits for failure to cooperate. In the event that it is found that an insured is no longer totally disabled, the waiver of premiums shall cease as of the date of such finding and the policy of insurance may be continued by payment of premiums as provided in said policy: *Provided further*, That in any case in which the Administrator finds that the insured's failure to make timely application for waiver of premiums or his failure to submit satisfactory evidence of the existence or continuance of total disability was due to circumstances beyond his control, the Administrator may grant waiver or continuance of waiver or premiums: *Provided further*, That in the event of death of the insured without filing application for waiver, the beneficiary, within 1 year after the death of the insured or of this enactment, whichever be the later, or, if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, within 1 year after removal of such legal disability, may file application for waiver with evidence of the insured's right to waiver under this section. Such application filed by the beneficiary shall have the same effect as if filed by the insured. In any case in which premiums are not waived under this subsection

solely because the insured died prior to the continuance of total disability for 6 months, and proof of such facts, satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed by the beneficiary with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after this enactment, or 1 year after the insured's death, whichever is the later date, his insurance shall be deemed to be in force at the date of his death: *And provided further*, That if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, proof of such facts may be filed within 1 year after removal of such legal disability. Premium rates shall be calculated without charge for the cost of the waiver of premiums herein provided and no deduction from benefits otherwise payable shall be made on account thereof."

SEC. 2. Subsection (r) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 6, strike out "or" and insert "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF PAXON FIELD, DUVAL COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1532) relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 or of any other law, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell all that tract or parcel of land described as part of the northwest quarter and the north half southwest quarter section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Fla., described as follows:

Beginning at an iron stake six hundred and seventy-two feet east of the northwest corner of section 8 and on the north line of said section; thence east one thousand three hundred and twenty-four and seven-tenths feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence east six hundred and thirty feet to an iron, set in concrete on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east along west side of said avenue one thousand nine hundred and eighty-five and two-tenths feet to an iron; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to an iron on the north line of Louisa Street; thence west one thousand three hundred and sixty-one and one-tenth feet to an iron; thence north two thousand six hundred and sixteen and two-tenths feet to place of beginning, containing one hundred and nine and thirty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Beginning at an iron, six hundred and seventy-two feet east and two thousand six hundred and seventy-six and two-tenths feet south of the northwest corner of section 8; thence east one thousand nine hundred and ninety-two and two-tenths feet to a concrete monument on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east along the west side of said avenue one thousand three hundred feet to an iron;

thence west one thousand four hundred and eleven and three-tenths feet to an iron; thence north fifty feet to an iron; thence west six hundred feet to an iron; thence north one thousand two hundred and fifty feet to place of beginning, containing fifty-nine and eight-tenths acres, more or less, and being the same land as shown as tracts 1 and 2 on plat recorded in plat book 13, page 82, public records of said county, and containing one hundred and sixty-nine and eighteen one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Part of south half southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Fla., bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a stone monument at the northwest corner of section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east; thence along west line of said section 8, south one degree sixteen minutes east two thousand six hundred and forty-six and four-tenths feet to a point; thence east one thousand nine hundred and seventy-four and three-tenths feet to a point; thence north zero degrees fifty minutes west thirty feet to an iron stake in the north line of Louisa Street for a place of beginning of lands to be described; from said place of beginning run east along the north line of Louisa Street six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake in the west line of Melson Avenue; thence along the west line of Melson Avenue north zero degrees fifty minutes west three hundred feet to an iron stake; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to place of beginning.

Recorded in deed book 700, at page 497, of the current public records of Duval County, Fla., containing 180 acres of land, more or less, together with all buildings, structures, and improvements thereon (known as Paxon Field), in the manner and subject to the terms and conditions provided in the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of Federal buildings," approved August 26, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, sec. 345b).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 3988) were laid on the table.

OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, McMAHON, and ABERNETHY.

REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with

Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, MILLER of Nebraska, and DEANE.

RELIEF OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1350) to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office is authorized, after consideration of the pertinent findings and if in concurrence with the determinations and recommendations of the head of the department or independent establishment concerned, to relieve any disbursing or other accountable officer or agent or former disbursing or other accountable officer or agent of any such department or independent establishment of the Government charged with responsibility on account of physical loss or deficiency for any reason whatsoever of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers in his charge, if the head of the department or independent establishment determines (1) that such loss or deficiency occurred while such officer or agent was acting in the discharge of his official duties, or that such loss or deficiency occurred by reason of the act or omission of a subordinate of such officer or agent; and (2) that such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of such officer or agent. This act shall be applicable only to the actual physical loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of such officers or agents resulting from illegal or erroneous payments.

SEC. 2. The paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge," approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "for any reason whatsoever."

And on page 2, strike out section 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. This act shall not operate to repeal the provisions of the paragraph of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled 'An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge,' approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a)."

XCIII—644

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of the bill as amended?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I shall be glad to do so.

When this bill was considered by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a subcommittee of three members was appointed to make a study and report. This committee consisted of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS], and myself.

This is a Senate bill. I understand it was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department.

This bill originally authorized relief for the Chief Disbursing Officer of the Treasury Department and others in the Department who were short in their accounts through no fault or negligence of their own. In the Senate it was amended to cover any disbursing officer in any department of the Government, including the Army and the Navy. When our committee took up this bill the Army and Navy objected to being included in this legislation, as both departments now have laws under which their disbursing officers are relieved from financial liability for losses which occur without negligence on their part. The General Accounting Office prefers to have all branches of the Government, including the Army and Navy, covered by one law. The committee decided, that because of the lack of time, no general bill could be agreed upon and considered at this session of Congress. We therefore recommended an amendment eliminating the Army and Navy from the provisions of this measure. The bill specifically provides that the laws relating to the relief of disbursing officers of the Army and Navy shall not be repealed.

At the present time, disbursing officers in other than the Army and Navy departments, can only be relieved of responsibility by the passage of a private bill by Congress, or by the filing of a suit by the officer or agent in the Court of Claims. This bill provides for the granting of administrative relief in these cases, and applies only where the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of the officer involved. The bill does not cover shortages or deficiencies resulting from illegal or erroneous payments.

This bill will take care of the situation until further time can be had to study this entire question. The Treasury Department is very anxious to have this bill passed at this session. The General Accounting Office has agreed to the bill in its present form. All departments are included except the Army and Navy. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee it is contemplated that a thorough study will be made of the entire situation in the next few months by the General Accounting Office, in conjunction with the proper Army and Navy officers in the hope a bill can be

introduced early in the next session which will be general in character, and which will include all departments, including the Army and Navy. This bill is necessary at this time in order to provide the relief sought by the Treasury Department, as well as other Government agencies, for their disbursing officers and agents who are short in their accounts through no fault or negligence of their own.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THE OFFICIAL SEAL, EMBLEM, AND NAME OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4186) to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill and the necessity for it?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are the host nation to the United Nations it is important that we protect the use of their seal and name against unauthorized commercial exploitation. By resolution of the United Nations General Assembly the member nations were requested to afford this protection, and as the nation in which the United Nations headquarters is located this is especially applicable to us. The bill protects valid trade-marks or copyrights which have been obtained using the name "United Nations," but does not permit renewals. Other users of the name or insignia before the United Nations Charter came into effect have a year in which to bring themselves into conformity with this bill when enacted into law. Trade-marks using the name have been registered for such things as women's apparel, textiles, and paper stationery. All other commercial exploitation of the emblem, name, or seal of the United Nations, aside from what I have specified, without permission of the Secretary-General of the United Nations is prohibited by this bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are as contained in the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. The penalty is as for a misdemeanor against any individual corporation, partnership, and so forth who use the United Nations name, emblem, or seal commercially without permission of the United Nations itself or as permitted by this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "United Nations Official Seal, Emblem, and Name Act, 1947."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public entity, public or private institution, group, or other entity, other than the United Nations.

(b) The term "United Nations" means the international organization established under that name by the Charter of the United Nations; and

(c) The "emblem or the official seal of the United Nations" may be described as follows: "A map of the world representing an azimuthal equidistant projection centered on the North Pole, inscribed in a wreath consisting of crossed conventionalized branches of the olive tree; in gold on a field of smoke-blue with all water areas in white. The projection of the map extends to 60 degrees south latitude, and includes five concentric circles."

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful, without the authorization of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for any person to use, whether as a trade-mark, commercial label, or portion thereof, or as an advertisement or insignia for any business or organization or for any trade, commercial, or charitable purpose, within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, the name or the abbreviation thereof through the use of its initial letters, the emblem, or the official seal of the United Nations, or any simulation thereof: *Provided*, That any person who, or whose assignor, actually used the name or the abbreviation thereof through the use of its initial letters, the emblem, or the official seal of the United Nations, or any simulation thereof may continue such use for the same purpose for a period not to exceed 1 year from the date of enactment of this act or for the period remaining, on the date of the enactment of this act, under a valid and subsisting trade-mark or copyright, which, however, shall not be subject to renewal: *Provided further*, That no such use shall be made with the fraudulent purpose of inducing the belief that it is sponsored by or in any way officially connected with the United Nations.

SEC. 4. Any person who willfully violates or attempts to violate any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine not exceeding \$500 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each and every offense.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "political entity."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "group", insert "the United States, including any State of the United States, any political subdivision of such government, and any legal successor, representative, agency, or agency of the foregoing."

Page 3, line 2, after the word "thereof", insert "before October 24, 1945."

Page 3, line 12, strike out "person" and insert "individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, groups, and any legal successor, representative, agent or agency of the foregoing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, MILLER of Nebraska, and DEANE.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4326) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the bill is.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely extends until March 1, 1948, the right of a farmer debtor to file a petition in bankruptcy under the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy in Railroad Reorganization has also favorably reported a bill to study and to revise the Frazier-Lemke Act. This merely extends the operation of the act until March when we will have an opportunity of revising and rewriting basic legislation; is that correct?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 75 (c) (U. S. C., title 11, sec. 203) of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, be and is amended to read as follows:

"(c) At any time prior to March 1, 1948, a petition may be filed by any farmer in the district court of the district in which he resides, stating that such farmer is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature and that it is desirable to effect a composition or an extension of time to pay his debts. The petition or answer of the farmer shall be accompanied by his schedules. If any such petition is filed, an order of adjudication shall not be entered except as provided hereinafter in this section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

GETTYSBURG NATIONAL PARK, PA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill does?

Mr. GROSS. There has been some disagreement there. The local cemetery, privately owned, adjoins the national cemetery, and it is simply straightening the line. The Department of the Interior recommends that this be done; the Bureau of the Budget also advises it. The Park Service will get 4 acres of land for which they will give an acre and a quarter to the local cemetery. It is like straightening a fence line between the two cemeteries.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of land within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept, on behalf of the United States, approximately 4 acres of non-Federal land within the park boundaries, such land to be conveyed to the United States without cost by the Evergreen Cemetery Association, of Gettysburg. Upon acceptance of title thereto by the United States, such property shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park. In exchange for the conveyance to the United States of the aforesaid property, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the Evergreen Cemetery Association approximately 1½ acres of federally owned land within the park, such property constituting a right-of-way through the Evergreen Cemetery property: *Provided*, That the aforesaid exchange shall be consummated only upon condition that the Secretary is satisfied that such exchange is in the public interest and that the properties to be exchanged are of approximately equal value.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 174, an act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for

Alaska, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, strike out all after "section," down to and including line 20 and insert "Any rights or privileges acquired hereunder with respect to mining operations in land, title to which is transferred to a future State upon its admission to the Union and which is situated within its boundaries, shall be terminable by such State, and the said mining operations shall be subject to the laws of such State."

Page 3, after line 20, insert:

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect or impair any valid claims, rights, or privileges, including possessory claims under the first proviso of section 8 of the act of May 17, 1884 (23 Stat. 26), arising under any other provision of law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA HEDWIG FERESZ

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1650) for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. CLASON. This bill came out of the Committee on the Judiciary, and after investigation by the Department of Justice it was disclosed that this woman had been in this country since 1939. They said the record showed that she was worthy of remaining in this country. She asks for permission to remain.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I recall, it was with unanimous consent from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLASON. I understood that it was.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Maria Hedwig Feresz, of Hadley, Mass., a Polish national who entered the United States in 1939 for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 1, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the period, insert: "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota for the first year that the same Polish quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 14 OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF JUNE 27, 1944

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1494) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 37).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical with House bill 966 that passed the House on June 19. It is an amendment to the Veterans' Preference Act. The Senate has passed its own bill. In order for this measure to become law it is necessary that either one or the other be adopted. That is the reason I am calling it to the attention of the House today.

Mr. RICH. Has your full committee considered it?

Mr. REES. It has the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the first proviso of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Provided, That such preference eligible shall have the right to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with such reasonable rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission; after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies of the same to the appellant or to his designated representative, and it shall be mandatory for such administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include three newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

CHEROKEE INDIAN RESERVATION, N. C.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 794) to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DEWART. This bill, which has been cleared by the majority leader and the minority leader, proposes to lease 2 acres on the Cherokee Indian Reservation to the Methodist Church for the purpose of building a church on that reservation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That with the consent of the authorized tribal authorities of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue a license to the Methodist Church to use from two to four acres of tribal land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C., for so long a time as such land may be used for church purposes, including the construction of a church building and a parsonage. The license shall be issued by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative upon such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreeable to the parties, and may be revoked only if and when the land ceases to be used for the purposes for which said license is issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEED KILLER

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 276.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas use of the preparation known as "2,4-D" has been widely recommended as an economical method of killing weeds; and

Whereas, on the basis of such recommendations, rice farmers have applied 2,4-D to their fields; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the 2,4-D dust has caused extensive damage to cotton crops located at considerable distances from the fields which were so dusted; and

Whereas there are reports that such dust has also damaged potatoes, soybeans, and other crops; and

Whereas the damage and possible complete destruction of such cotton and other crops will constitute a severe loss to the Nation

and an incalculable blow to the individual farmers concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested—

(1) to use the facilities of the Department of Agriculture and the radio, press, and various farm groups and organizations to make known to the Nation at once the fact that 2,4-D can be used only with extreme caution;

(2) to make an immediate investigation to determine (a) what crops are harmed by 2,4-D and (b) how far 2,4-D dust will carry and have harmful effects when distributed by airplane and when distributed by ground equipment;

(3) to make a study to determine whether existing supplies of 2,4-D can be mixed with other chemicals in a preparation which will not be harmful to cotton and to other economically valuable plants; and

(4) to make known to the Nation the results of the investigation conducted pursuant to paragraph (2) and of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (3).

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. **HOPE**. This resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. It requests the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate steps to prevent further damage to crops as a result of the use of the weed killer known as 2,4-D, which is a very potent weed killer, one of the new chemicals. It is being used quite extensively in the rice fields in the South.

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. Is this the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. **LARCADE**]?

Mr. **HOPE**. Yes. It was introduced by him as the result of the immense damage in the cotton fields of Louisiana and Texas which is reported to be occasioned by the use of this chemical.

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. **DONDERO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4068) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. **WHITTINGTON**. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this includes the amendment adopted by the committee?

Mr. **DONDERO**. It does.

Mr. **RICH**. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the cost of the construction of this building?

Mr. **DONDERO**. The cost of the building will be \$22,850,000, but no appropriation is asked for prior to 1950.

Mr. **RICH**. The idea is to permit the Federal Works Administrator to proceed with the preparation of plans and specifications so that they may be ready in 1950?

Mr. **DONDERO**. That is correct. I may say to the gentleman that \$7,000,000 has already been appropriated, and the excavation has been made for the basement. That is to prepare the plans so as to be ready for the construction of the building in 1950.

Mr. **LECOMPTE**. This is an authorization?

Mr. **DONDERO**. That is right.

Mr. **RICH**. The construction of this building will release a lot of buildings that are now being occupied in the District by this agency? All the divisions of the General Accounting Office will then be housed in the two buildings?

Mr. **DONDERO**. In one building. The General Accounting Office is now housed in 21 buildings in the District.

Mr. **RICH**. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in lieu of completing the construction of the building authorized by the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 1036), for the use and occupancy of the General Accounting Office, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to construct upon square 518 in the District of Columbia a building for the use and occupancy of the General Accounting Office under a limit cost of \$22,850,000, exclusive of funds heretofore obligated or expended for the account of the building hereby superseded: *Provided*, That to the extent practicable, the excavations and construction work heretofore performed upon said site for the building hereby superseded may be utilized for the building herein authorized: *Provided further*, That all powers granted the Federal Works Administrator with respect to the building for the General Accounting Office in the District of Columbia by said First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, are hereby continued and may be exercised for the purpose of this act within the limits herein fixed.

SEC. 2. The balances of any funds heretofore appropriated under authority of said First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, for the building superseded by the building herein authorized which are unexpended and unobligated on the date of approval of this act, are hereby made available for the purpose of, and shall be chargeable against the authorization contained in this act; and the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the construction of the building herein authorized within the full limit of cost as established pursuant to section 1 hereof, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations for the full amount of such cost may not have been made.

SEC. 3. No appropriation of funds, in addition to those continued available by section 2 of this act, shall be made for expenditure during any fiscal year prior to 1950: *Provided*, That for expenditure during the fiscal year 1950 and thereafter, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such

sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act within the limit of cost of \$22,850,000 herein fixed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 22, after "authorized", strike out "within the full limit of cost as established pursuant to section 1 hereof, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations for the full amount of such cost may not have been made" and insert "as funds are appropriated or contract authorization are provided therefor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERADICATION OF WATER POLLUTION IN NEW ENGLAND STATES

Mr. **DONDERO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1418) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us some explanation of the bill?

Mr. **DONDERO**. This bill authorizes the New England States to enter into a compact for the purpose of solving their own steam-pollution problems. I think the Congress of the United States should encourage this kind of legislation.

Mr. **SEELY-BROWN**. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill gives congressional consent to an interstate compact relating to the control and eradication of the pollution of the streams and waters of the New England States which was entered into under authority of Public Resolution 104, Seventy-fourth Congress. It was introduced by Senator Baldwin and other New England Senators, and many of the New England Members of the House also have introduced a similar bill.

Mr. **WHITTINGTON**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. I yield.

Mr. **WHITTINGTON**. This bill has a favorable report from the department and it was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the status of the general bill, the Barkley or Mundt stream-pollution bill?

Mr. **DONDERO**. Hearings have been held, I will say to the gentleman, on such legislation, but the committee has not reported a bill. I believe that will be done when Congress convenes for the next session.

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the control and reduction of pollution of the streams and waters of the New England States negotiated and entered into or to be entered into under authority of Public Resolution 104, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 8, 1936, and now ratified by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, which compact reads as follows:

"NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMPACT"

"Whereas the growth of population and the development of the territory of the New England States has resulted in serious pollution of certain interstate streams, ponds, and lakes, and of tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two or more States; and

"Whereas such pollution constitutes a menace to the health, welfare, and economic prosperity of the people living in such area; and

"Whereas the abatement of existing pollution and the control of future pollution in the interstate waters of the New England area are of prime importance to the people and can best be accomplished through the cooperation of the New England States in the establishment of an interstate agency to work with the States in the field of pollution abatement;

"Now, therefore, the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont do agree and are bound as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"It is agreed between the signatory States that the provisions of this compact shall apply to streams, ponds, and lakes which are contiguous to two or more signatory States or which flow through two or more signatory States or which have a tributary contiguous to two or more signatory States or flowing through two or more signatory States, and also shall apply to tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two States.

"ARTICLE II

"There is hereby created the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) which shall be a body corporate and politic, having the powers, duties, and jurisdiction herein enumerated and such other and additional powers as shall be conferred upon it by the act or acts of a signatory State concurred in by the others.

"ARTICLE III

"The commission shall consist of five commissioners from each signatory State, each of whom shall be a resident voter of the State from which he is appointed. The commissioners shall be chosen in the manner and for the terms provided by law of the State from which they shall be appointed. For each State there shall be on the commission a member representing the State health department, a member representing the State water pollution control board (if such exists), and, except where a State in its enabling legislation decides that the best interests of the State will be otherwise served, a member representing municipal interests, a member representing industrial interests, and a member representing an agency acting for fisheries or conservation.

"ARTICLE IV

"The commission shall annually elect from its members a chairman and vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge such officers. It may appoint and employ a secretary who shall be a professional engineer versed in water pollution and may employ such stenographic or cler-

ical employees as shall be necessary, and at its pleasure remove or discharge such employees. It shall adopt a seal and suitable bylaws and shall promulgate rules and regulations for its management and control. It may maintain an office for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place within the signatory States. Meetings shall be held at least twice each year. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but no action of the commission imposing any obligation on any signatory State or on any municipal agency or subdivision thereof or on any person, firm, or corporation therein shall be binding unless a majority of the members from such signatory State shall have voted in favor thereof. Where meetings are planned to discuss matters relevant to problems of water pollution control affecting only certain of the signatory States, the commission may vote to authorize special meetings of the commissioners of the States especially concerned. The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall make an annual report to the governor and the legislature of each signatory State setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this compact, and shall make recommendations for any legislative action deemed by it advisable, including amendments to the statutes of the signatory States which may be necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this compact. The commission shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office, administrative, traveling, or other expenses prior to the allotment of funds by the signatory States adequate to meet the same; nor shall the commission pledge the credit of any of the signatory States. Each signatory State reserves the right to provide hereafter by law for the examination and audit of the accounts of the commission. The commission shall appoint a treasurer who may be a member of the commission, and disbursements by the commission shall be valid only when authorized by the commission and when vouchers therefor have been signed by the secretary and countersigned by the treasurer. The secretary shall be custodian of the records of the commission with authority to attest to and certify such records or copies thereof.

"ARTICLE V

"It is recognized, owing to such variable factors as location, size, character, and flow and the many varied uses of the waters subject to the terms of this compact, that no single standard of sewage and waste treatment and no single standard of quality of receiving waters is practical and that the degree of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes should take into account the classification of the receiving waters according to present and proposed highest use, such as for drinking water supply, industrial and agricultural uses, bathing and other recreational purposes, maintenance and propagation of fish life, shellfish culture, navigation, and disposal of wastes.

"The commission shall establish reasonable physical, chemical, and bacteriological standards of water quality satisfactory for various classifications of use. It is agreed that each of the signatory States through appropriate agencies will prepare a classification of its interstate waters in entirety or by portions according to present and proposed highest use and for this purpose technical experts employed by State departments of health and State water pollution control agencies are authorized to confer on questions relating to classification of interstate waters affecting two or more States. Each signatory State agrees to submit its classification of its interstate waters to the commission for approval. It is agreed that after such approval all signatory States through their

appropriate State health departments and water pollution control agencies will work to establish programs of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes which will meet standards established by the commission for classified waters. The commission may from time to time make such changes in definitions of classifications and in standards as may be required by changed conditions or as may be necessary for uniformity.

"ARTICLE VI

"Each of the signatory states pledges to provide for the abatement of existing pollution and for the control of future pollution of interstate inland and tidal waters as described in article I, and to put and maintain the waters thereof in a satisfactory condition consistent with the highest classified use of each body of water.

"ARTICLE VII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or prevent the enforcement of any requirement by any signatory State imposing any additional condition or restriction to further lessen the pollution of waters within its jurisdiction. Nothing herein contained shall affect or abate any action now pending brought by any governmental board or body created by or existing under any of the signatory States.

"ARTICLE VIII

"The signatory States agree to appropriate for the salaries, office, administrative, travel, and other expenses such sum or sums as shall be recommended by the commission. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts obligates itself only to the extent of \$6,500 in any one year, the State of Connecticut only to the extent of \$3,000 in any one year, the State of Rhode Island only to the extent of \$1,500 in any one year, and the States of New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont each only to the extent of \$1,000 in any one year.

"ARTICLE IX

"Should any part of this compact be held to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States, all other parts thereof shall continue to be in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE X

"The commission is authorized to discuss with appropriate State agencies in New York State questions of pollution of waters which flow into the New England area from New York State or vice versa and to further the establishment of agreements on pollution abatement to promote the interests of the New York and New England areas.

"Whenever the commission by majority vote of the members of each signatory State shall have given its approval and the State of New York shall have taken the necessary action to do so, the State of New York shall be a party to this compact for the purpose of controlling and abating the pollution of waterways common to New York and the New England States signatory to this compact but excluding the waters under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Sanitation Commission (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut).

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact shall become effective immediately upon the adoption of the compact by any two contiguous States of New England but only insofar as applies to those States and upon approval by Federal law. Thereafter upon ratification by other contiguous States it shall also become effective as to those States."

SEC. 2. Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and to the State of New York pursuant to article X of the compact, to enter into the

compact as a signatory State and party thereto.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act or in the compact herein approved shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of the compact.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

QUIETING TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4115) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman, may I say this bill simply quiets title to a small parcel of land that was deeded to the United States by someone recently. The United States has no use for it. The report shows that the bill was reported unanimously by our committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby releases the quitclaims to Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell, husband and wife, all the right, title, and interest, if any, of the United States of America in and to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md., more particularly described in a deed which purported to convey such land to the United States of America as follows: The southerly $12\frac{1}{10}$ feet front, extended by the same width, the full length thereof lot No. 1431, and the northerly 46 feet front, extended by the same width, the full length thereof of lot No. 1432 all in block 63 of section 9 of the subdivision known as Cheverly, according to the official plot and survey thereof of record among the land records of said county; such deed being executed on December 28, 1942, by the said Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell, and recorded in the land records of such county in liber No. 694 beginning at folio 48.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4140) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to permit the State of New Jersey and the State of Pennsylvania to enter into an agreement for the building of a toll bridge across the Delaware River. It was unanimously reported out by our committee, the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. It was unanimously reported by our committee.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. This is merely an extension of the authority that the Joint Bridge Commission now has?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the Reorganization Act, are not these bills supposed to be handled administratively, without having to come before the Congress?

Mr. DONDERO. This is a compact between two States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman's motion is to adopt this bill with a committee amendment?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof.

"SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

"AMENDING THE AGREEMENT ENTITLED 'AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY CREATING THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION AS A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC AND DEFINING ITS POWERS AND DUTIES', BY EXTENDING THE JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION AND DEFINING SUCH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES

"Whereas, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'commission') was created by a compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commis-

sion as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties,' executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved the 25th day of June, 1931 (pamphlet laws, 1352), as last amended by an act of said general assembly approved the 18th day of May, 1933 (pamphlet laws, 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its Senate and general assembly approved June 11, 1934 (ch. 215, laws of 1934; R. S. (1937) 32:8-1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an act of the Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public No. 411, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1051, 1058), and under the provisions of which compact or agreement the commission was authorized to administer, maintain and operate certain bridges over the Delaware River and now maintains and operates the same as joint State-owned free bridges; and

"Whereas because of the great increase in traffic and loads over said bridges since their construction, many of said bridges are now inadequate or unsafe, and it will be necessary to rehabilitate or replace some or all of said bridges with new bridges at the same or different locations in order to provide safe, adequate and convenient facilities for traffic crossing the Delaware River; and

"Whereas it is necessary that the commission have power to issue and sell its bridge revenue bonds, for rehabilitating or replacing existing bridges with new bridges at the same or different locations, for acquiring or constructing additional bridges, and for refunding any bridge revenue bonds of the commission, and that the commission also have power to fix, charge and collect tolls, rates, rents and other charges for the use of any such new bridge or bridges; now therefore,

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

"(1) Article IX of the agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties, which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December, 1934, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE IX

"The commission shall make annual reports to the Governors and Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, setting forth in detail its operations and transactions, and may make such additional reports, from time to time, to the governors and legislatures as it may deem advisable.

"(2) Article X of said agreement be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE X

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement the commission shall have the following powers:

"(a) The commission may acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, repair, and operate bridges for vehicular or pedestrian traffic across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey at any locations north of the boundary line between Mercer County and Burlington County in the State of New Jersey as extended across the Dela-

ware River to the Pennsylvania shore of said river.

"(b) The commission may replace any one or more existing bridges across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey north of said line with one or more new bridges at such locations as the Commission may determine to be adequate and convenient for the traffic to be served thereby.

"(c) The commission may acquire by purchase or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain any existing ferry or bridge the acquisition of which the commission may determine to be necessary or advisable in connection with the construction of a new bridge, the cost of such acquisition to be deemed to be a part of the cost of such construction.

"(d) The commission may enter upon, use, occupy, enlarge, construct, and improve any street, road, or highway located within the limits of any municipality and deemed by the commission to be necessary in connection with the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, or operation of any bridge owned or operated by the commission or of any bridge approaches, bridge plazas, or approach highways to any such bridge, subject, however, to the consent of the governing body of such municipality and to such reasonable police regulations as may be established by such governing body.

"(e) The commission may demolish and remove any bridge now operated by it when such bridge has been or is being replaced by a new bridge at the same or a different location which in the determination of the commission will serve substantially the same traffic as that served by such existing bridge, and the commission may sell or otherwise dispose of any ferry or other property of the commission deemed by it to be no longer useful or needed for the purposes of the commission.

"(f) The commission may acquire for the purposes of this article any real property which it shall find necessary or convenient to acquire for public use in the manner provided by article III of this agreement or, in the alternative, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the same manner and with the same right of entry as the highway department of the Commonwealth may acquire lands by condemnation for highway purposes and in the State of New Jersey in the same manner and with the same right of entry as the highway department of the State may acquire lands by condemnation for highway purposes.

"(g) The commission may make and enforce such rules and regulations with respect to the use of any bridge operated by it as it shall deem proper and reasonable, including regulations limiting the loads permitted on any such bridge and closing to traffic any such bridge deemed by the commission to be unsafe.

"(h) The commission may provide, from time to time, for the issuance of its bridge revenue bonds for any one or more of the following purposes: (1) providing funds for the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation or improvement of any one or more bridges the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation or improvement of which is herein authorized; (2) providing funds for the construction or improvement of approach facilities deemed by the commission to be necessary or desirable in connection with the acquisition, construction, maintenance or operation of any bridge owned or operated by the commission, including but without limitation bridge approaches, entrance plazas, overpasses, underpasses and approach highways; and (3) refunding any bridge revenue bonds or bridge revenue refunding bonds of the commission. The bridge or bridges (including any approach facilities) on account of which a single issue of bonds shall be issued as herein authorized shall constitute a single project for financing purposes.

"(1) The commission may fix, charge, and collect tolls, rates, rents, and other charges for the use of any bridge or bridges constituting a single project, such tolls to be so fixed and adjusted, subject to any applicable Federal law, as to provide funds at least sufficient (1) to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge or bridges, including the administrative expenses of the commission chargeable thereto, (2) to pay the bridge revenue bonds or the bridge revenue refunding bonds issued on account of such project and the interest on such bonds, and (3) to provide reserves for such purposes; provided, however, that no tolls shall be charged or collected for the use of any bridge now operated by the commission as a free bridge but only for the use of bridges constructed or acquired by the commission under the provisions of this compact or agreement. Subject to any applicable Federal law, the commission may pledge such tolls, rates, rents and other revenues or any part thereof for such purposes. The commission may establish separate schedules of tolls, rates, and charges for use of any bridge on which tolls may be established hereunder by residents of areas adjacent to or served directly by such bridge under such conditions and on such terms as it shall determine to be proper and reasonable, including tolls, rates, and charges for unlimited use of any such bridge.

"No member of the commission shall be subject to any personal liability or accountability by reason of any act or omission of the commission.

"In witness whereof, this 3d day of July 1947, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

"ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,

[SEAL] "Governor, State of New Jersey.

"And, on this 8th day of July 1947, James H. Duff has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

"JAS. H. DUFF,

"Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

[GREAT SEAL]

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after "thereof", insert "And provided further, That after the costs of the bridges in a single project have been amortized, such bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT-OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill does?

Mr. WELCH. The bill provides for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries. Under the amendment which will be offered, it limits the expan-

sion of two military cemeteries, one at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., and the other at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say these are national cemeteries which are now in existence. Adjacent to those cemeteries there is acreage owned by the Government, and it is purely an expansion matter. There are no new cemeteries. It is just an expansion of two old cemeteries. It is without the acquisition of any property. The property is now owned by the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this thing limited to these two cemeteries?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is limited to these two cemeteries.

Mr. RANKIN. That crazy order issued by the War Department recently forbidding race segregation in national cemeteries has virtually closed those cemeteries to the white boys of the South. If you want to make this an individual proposition, all right, but I do not want any such measure as this covering the whole country.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say I have four telegrams here. They have bodies there and there are no graves to put them in. It is an emergency situation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman tell us how much money is involved?

Mr. WELCH. There are no funds involved.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. What is the acreage involved in these cemeteries?

Mr. WELCH. I do not recall the acreage in the Jefferson Barracks. Fort Rosecrans, Calif., has 34 acres.

Mr. BUCK. What is the acreage at Jefferson Barracks?

Mr. WELCH. I do not remember the exact acreage.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I spoke to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FLOESER], in whose district the Jefferson Barracks is located, and he said they would probably want about 50 acres. They have a large acreage, but they would need only about 50 acres in addition to the present national cemetery.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. What I am trying to find out is what is in the amendment that is going to be proposed.

Mr. WELCH. If the gentleman will withhold his right to object until the amendment is read, I am sure he will approve the bill as amended.

Mr. RANKIN. It will have to be rather convincing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve my objection until I can find out what is in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the right to object.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "utilize", insert the words "and expand existing facilities."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "practicable", insert "through the use of."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the words "establish thereon" and insert the words "expand existing."

And on page 2, line 7, after the word "maintenance", strike out "of such cemeteries" and insert the word "thereof."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "cemetery", strike out the word "established" and insert the words "as expanded."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentlemen from California, either one or both of them, if this applies to the entire country?

Mr. WELCH. No; it is confined to two cemeteries.

Mr. RANKIN. Where is it limited to two?

Mr. WELCH. It is limited to two under the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I want to find out, if it is limited to two cemeteries; and if so, which two.

The War Department, as I said, has issued a crazy order which has virtually closed national cemeteries to the white boys of the Southern States, and probably a great many other States. I am not going to let this measure pass if it is to be Nation-wide in its scope.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from California that he withdraw his request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the War Department letter made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, that ought to be put in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman that the bill be withdrawn until these differences are ironed out.

Mr. RANKIN. Let him write it into the bill.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

IMPLEMENTING PATENT PROVISIONS OF PEACE TREATIES WITH ITALY, BULGARIA, HUNGARY, AND RUMANIA

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes. This came out of the Committee on the Judiciary. It simply extends the provisions of the Boykin Act of last year to Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the State Department has requested the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEWIS. The State Department and the Patent Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 1883, as amended, is considered as reestablished and in full force and effect between the United States and Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania from the date of this act and the nationals of the latter countries may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof as provided in article 2 of said convention: *Provided, however,* That patents shall not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for inventions relating to war materials as specified in article 6 of annex XV A of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, article 6 of annex IV of the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria, article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary, and article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Rumania.

Sec. 2. The rights of priority and the times for the taking of any action specified in sections 1 and 3 of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 8, 1946, which had not expired on December 8, 1941, or which commenced after such date, shall be and are hereby extended until February 29, 1948, in favor of nationals of Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, subject to the conditions and limitations specified in sections 1, 3, 4, and 10 of said Public Law 690.

Sec. 3. Nationals of Germany and Japan may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions in accordance with the patent laws and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof: *Provided, however,* That patents obtained for such inventions shall be subject to any conditions and limitations with respect to duration, revocation, utilization, assignment, and licensing which may be imposed by Congress, or by the President, patents may not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for any invention made, or upon which an application was filed by any such national, before January 1, 1946, in Germany or Japan or in the territory of any other of the Axis Powers or in any territory occupied by the Axis forces.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "inventions", insert the words "heretofore made."

Page 2, line 17, after the figures "690", insert "*Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall affect any act which has been or shall be done by virtue of special measures taken under legislative, executive, administrative, or military authority of the United States during World War II."

Page 3, line 4, after the word "President", insert "in accordance with the provisions of any peace treaty hereafter entered into with Germany or Japan: *And provided further,*."

Page 3, line 6, after the word "That," insert "except for patents based on applications filed in the United States Patent Office prior to the date of enactment of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Federal Aid for Education and include a statement.

Mr. DAWSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio statement.

AMENDMENT TO ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT OF 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3501) to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out "excluding" and insert "and."

Page 3, line 19, after "discharge", insert "including for enlisted persons the allowances as provided for such enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section."

Page 5, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 12 on page 6.

Page 6, line 13, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "5" and insert "4."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPLORATION, INVESTIGATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND MAINTENANCE OF FISHING RESOURCES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 859) to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, after "Hawaii", insert "*Provided further,* That there are authorized to be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service not to exceed three surplus vessels suitable for conversion and use in oceanographic and biological research and exploratory fishing, by any disposal agency of the Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIDELITY TRUST CO., OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 892) for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what amount is involved and does the full committee from which this comes approve of it?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. This bill has been passed by the official objectors. There was some misunderstanding with reference to it the other day and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. RICH. Has the committee in charge approved it?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, and the official objectors have also approved it.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman's word is good, but where are you going to get the money?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and allow without interest the claims as hereinafter set forth for the refund of bankers' special taxes paid under the War Revenue Act of June 13, 1898, and under the Emergency Revenue Act of October 22, 1914, and later held to have been erroneously and illegally collected by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Fidelity and Deposit Company v. United States (259 U. S. 296) and the United States v. Fidelity and Deposit Company (266 U. S. 587), which claims are covered by the findings of fact made on June 5, 1944, by the United States Court of Claims and reported at pages 13, 14, and 15 of Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as follows:

17767. Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., \$2,116.86.

17768. Maryland Trust Co., successors to Continental Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., \$3,323.30.

17769. Baltimore Trust Corp., liquidating agent of Baltimore Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., \$3,409.34.

17770. Safe Deposit & Trust Co. of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., \$66.

17771. Union Trust Co. of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., \$867.67.

17772. Citizens National Trust & Savings Bank of Los Angeles, successors to Citizens Trust & Savings Co., Los Angeles, Calif., \$1,108.92.

17773. Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif., \$1,074.90.

17774. International Trust Co., Denver, Colo., \$993.50.

17775. Phoenix State Bank & Trust Co., successors to State Bank, Hartford, Conn., \$397.42.

17776. Stamford Trust Co., Stamford, Conn., \$636.17.

17778. Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Tampa, Fla., \$323.50.

17779. Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., \$4,219.80.

17780. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., \$5,179.17.

17781. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Hibernian Banking Association, Chicago, Ill., \$2,170.

17782. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., \$9,512.

17783. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., \$10,706.23.

17784. Peoples Trust & Savings Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., \$155.04.

17785. Security Trust Co., Indianapolis, Ind., \$153.34.

17786. First National Bank & Trust Co., successors to Phoenix & Third Trust Co., Lexington, Ky., \$104.

17787. State Bank & Trust Co., Richmond, Ky., \$154.50.

17789. Franklin County Trust Co., Greenfield, Mass., \$75.99.

17790. Security Trust Co., Lynn, Mass., \$148.26.

17791. Berkshire Trust Co., formerly Berkshire Loan & Trust Co., Pittsfield, Mass., \$117.99.

17792. Springfield Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Springfield, Mass., \$170.67.

17793. Detroit Trust Co., successors to Security Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., \$1,392.50.

17794. Union Guardian Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., \$440.50.

17795. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., \$197.49.

17796. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., \$9,283.50.

17797. Mississippi Valley Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., \$8,223.84.

17799. Hudson Trust Co., Union City, N. J., \$2,036.25.

17800. Paterson Savings Institution, Paterson, N. J., \$2,438.

17802. Morristown Trust Co., Morristown, N. J., \$2,737.45.

17803. Cumberland National Bank of Bridgeton, successors to the Cumberland Trust Co., of Bridgeton, Bridgeton, N. J., \$100.46.

17804. Brooklyn Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., \$1,525.

17805. Kings County Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., \$2,864.57.

17806. National City Bank of New York, successors to Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., \$570.50.

17807. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Buffalo Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., \$101.

17808. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Bankers Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., \$878.51.

17809. Chemical Bank & Trust Co., successors to United States Mortgage & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., \$3,845.50.

17810. Title Guarantee & Trust Co. of New York City, N. Y., successors to Manufacturers Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., \$3,798.

17811. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., \$16,502.52.

17812. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., \$7,300.

17813. Lawyers Trust Co., successors to Central Realty Bond & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., \$1,078.75.

17814. United States Trust Co. of New York, New York City, N. Y., \$15,706.50.

17816. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to Trust & Deposit Co. of Onondaga, Syracuse, N. Y., \$1,555.17.

17817. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., \$132.11.

17818. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., \$438.67.

17819. City Savings Bank & Trust Co., Alliance, Ohio, \$226.32.

17820. Fifth Third Union Trust Co., successors to Union Savings Bank & Trust Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, \$1,836.33.

17821. Central National Bank, successors to Central United National Bank, successors to the United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, \$0.00.

17822. Central National Bank, successors to Central United National Bank, successors to the United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, \$1,297.99.

17823. Union Trust Co., successors to the Broadway Savings & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, \$734.01.

17824. Union Trust Co., successors to the State Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, \$565.67.

17825. Toledo Trust Co., formerly Toledo Savings Bank & Trust Co., Toledo, Ohio, \$622.67.

17826. Easton Trust Co., Easton, Pa., \$502.67.

17827. Central Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., \$210.01.

17828. Harrisburg Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., \$545.50.

17829. Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., successors to Logan Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$1,706.81.

17830. Germantown Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$459.33.

17831. Girard Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$10,859.33.

17832. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$1,147.03.

17833. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$1,794.

17834. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$0.00.

17835. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$8,136.61.

17836. Integrity Trust Co., successors to the West Philadelphia Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$932.33.

17837. Fidelity Trust Co., formerly Fidelity Title & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., \$1,932.94.

17838. Miners' National Bank of Wilkes-Barre, successors to Wyoming Valley Trust Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., \$805.16.

17839. First National Bank, successors to Sunbury Trust & Safe Deposit Co., Sunbury, Pa., \$416.66.

17840. Wakefield Trust Co., Wakefield, R. I., \$669.

17841. Zion's Saving Bank & Trust Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, \$712.

17843. Lynchburg Trust & Savings Bank, Lynchburg, Va., \$162.90.

17844. Spokane & Eastern Trust Co., Spokane, Wash., \$426.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the claims allowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue pursuant to the preceding section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and any such payment

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT-OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY AS NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will withdraw my reservation of objection with the understanding that the amendments to be offered will apply to those two cemeteries only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when the Secretary of War determines that there is need for an additional cemetery or cemeteries for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for by existing law (24 U. S. C. 281), he is authorized to utilize, when practicable, federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the War Department for military purposes and not needed for such purposes for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery or cemeteries.

SEC. 2. Upon the selection by the Secretary of War of such land, as provided in section 1 hereof, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish thereon national cemeteries and to provide for the care and maintenance of such cemeteries. No national cemetery established pursuant to this act shall have an area in excess of 640 acres.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "utilize", insert "and expand existing facilities at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., and Jefferson Barracks, Mo., and on page 1, line 9, after the word "practicable", insert "through the use of."

On page 2, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the words "establish thereon" and insert the words "expand existing" and on page 2, line 7, after the word "maintenance", strike out the words "of such cemeteries" and insert the word "thereof."

On page 2, line 7, after the word "cemetery", strike out word "established" and insert words "as expanded."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should explain to the House the reason for my attitude on this measure.

The War Department recently issued an order forbidding race segregation in our national cemeteries.

That simply means the closing of the national cemeteries to the white boys of the Southern States and a large portion of the rest of the country. The white boys of the South will hereafter be buried in the local cemeteries.

For that reason I am not willing to have this program expanded throughout the entire country. I agreed to withdraw my objection with the understanding that the gentleman from California would offer this amendment limiting it to the western cemeteries.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD four telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. The telegrams referred to are as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., July 22, 1947.

HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Report just received. All grave space for veterans' purposes at national cemetery, Fort Rosecrans, has been used. Urgently request expedite action allocation additional ground for graves. Notwithstanding reallocation of overseas war dead need is immediate as veterans of San Diego County are dying now.

B. G. HAMBLIN,
Executive Secretary,

San Diego County Council of Veterans.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., July 22, 1947.

HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Congressman:

No more graves in Rosecrans. Bodies waiting burial in private cemeteries. Immediate action requested.

WALTER J. PARKER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., July 23, 1947.

HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
House of Representatives:

Rosecrans cemetery situation critical. Urge passage your bill this session.

SAN DIEGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., July 22, 1947.

HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery closed today. San Diego situation critical. Veterans awaiting burial. Request immediate action on development of additional acreage.

R. J. COSGRIFF,
Service Officer, Chapter No. 2,
Disabled American Veterans.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3394, "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States,' approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes," do pass with the following Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "War", insert "except as expressly reserved to the American Battle Monuments Commission by section 9 of this act."

Page 5, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 9. The American Battle Monuments Commission shall be solely responsible for the permanent design and construction of the cemeteries to be established in foreign countries under section 5 of this act and of all buildings, plantings, headstones, and other permanent improvements incidental thereto. The Secretary of War is authorized to undertake such temporary construction as will be necessary for the accomplishment of this act and to maintain such cemeteries in a suitable condition until such time as the functions of administration thereof shall pass to the American Battle Monuments Commission in accordance with section 12 of Public Law 456, Seventy-ninth Congress, or any other law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND OF THE NAVY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3215, an act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "Section", insert "the Sanitary Engineering Section."

Page 4, line 1, strike out all after "Surgeon" down to and including "promotion" in line 8 and insert "General, and each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Medical Service Corps who at the time of appointment holds a degree of doctor of philosophy or comparable degree recognized by the Surgeon General in a science allied

to medicine may, subject to regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of War, be credited at the time of appointment with an amount of service equal to 3 years."

Page 11, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 11 on page 12 and insert:

"Hereafter the authorized strength of the Hospital Corps of the Navy shall equal 3½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to establish such grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps as he may deem necessary in the proper administration of such corps: *Provided*, That enlisted men of other ratings in the Navy and in the Marine Corps shall be eligible for transfer to the Hospital Corps, and men of that corps to other ratings in the Navy and the Marine Corps."

Page 12, strike out all after line 13 down to and including line 17 and insert "The Secretary of the Navy may hereafter appoint as many warrant officers in the Hospital Corps, as may be deemed necessary, from the rating of chief petty officer or petty officer, first class, in the Hospital Corps: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of this measure?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3215 passed the House unanimously some time ago. It went over to the Senate and was amended only for the purpose of bringing it in conformity with the provisions of the promotion bill recently acted upon.

In its consideration of H. R. 3215, the Senate Armed Services Committee adopted three amendments, one of which was proposed by the Army and the other two by the Navy.

The sole purpose of the Army amendment is to bring the provisions of H. R. 3215 into conformity with the provisions of the promotion bill, H. R. 3830.

The Navy amendments go to title III of the bill and are made for the purpose of bringing the language of this bill into conformity with the present policy of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in determining the appropriate names to be applied to members in the Hospital Corps. The Bureau of Naval Personnel desires administrative flexibility in this regard and there appears to be no reason why the request should not be granted.

Another amendment approved by the Senate would add a "Sanitary Engineer Section". There is no objection to this. In fact testimony at the hearings indicated that other sections would be added as needed under the authority of this bill. In connection with the Senate committee amendment, I would like to include correspondence in explanation.

H. R. 3215, "To revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes" is now on its way to the President for his signature.

The Navy Department writes me that the words "pharmacists" or "pharmacists' mates" will not be used in describing the titles of the grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps of the Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1947.
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

My DEAR Mrs. SMITH: Enclosed for your information is a copy of a letter which I have transmitted to Mr. George H. Frates, the Washington representative of the National Association of Retail Druggists, assuring him that the Navy Department will not continue to describe members of the Hospital Corps of the Navy as "pharmacists" or "pharmacists' mates" should the bill H. R. 3215 be enacted in the form in which it was reported to the Senate.

The Navy Department requested the Senate Committee on Armed Services to amend title III of the bill for reasons which do not go to the substance of the measure but for reasons which have only to do with its practical administration. These reasons are:

(a) There is a possibility of having no legal authority for membership in the Hospital Corps at all during the interim necessary to shift from one nomenclature to another.

(b) The most appropriate new names to be applied to the members of the Hospital Corps have not been determined.

(c) The names of other ratings in the Navy are not frozen by statute. Administrative flexibility in fixing such names is desirable. Had there been such flexibility in the case of pharmacists' mates, a change in the law would not be necessary at this time. The Secretary of the Navy could have made the change by administrative action.

Very respectfully,

IRA H. NUNN,
Legislative Counsel.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1947.
Mr. GEORGE H. FRATES,
National Association of
Retail Druggists,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. FRATES: This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation of yesterday during which I assured you that, if and when the bill H. R. 3215, "To revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes" becomes law in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate, the Navy Department will not employ the words "pharmacist" or "pharmacists' mates" in describing the titles of the grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps of the Navy. The Navy Department will, on the other hand, abandon the use of those terms for the purpose for which they are now employed as soon as practicable after any act of the Congress becomes law which alters the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to permit other phraseology to be used in designating the grades and ratings of the Hospital Corps of the Navy.

You will note that an amendment to title III of the bill, H. R. 3215, which was adopted by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate at the request of the Navy Department will, if enacted, amend the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Navy "to establish such grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps as he may deem necessary," thus providing adequate authority to abandon the present restrictive phraseology.

I am aware of the interest of the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH and of the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, both Members of the House of Representatives, in this matter and am sending a copy of this letter to each in order that they may be advised of the intentions of the Navy Department.

Sincerely yours,

IRA H. NUNN,
Captain, USN,
Legislative Counsel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF DELAWARE OF A PORTION OF PEA PATCH ISLAND

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1480) authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Delaware all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to Pea Patch Island, situated in the Delaware River, near Delaware City, Del., except that portion of the island lying northeastwardly of a straight line just northeastwardly from the northeast outside wall of the Fort Delaware moat and 80 feet northeastwardly at right angles from triangulation station "Torpedo" from a point in the southeasterly high-water line to a point in the northwesterly high-water line of the island, reserving to the United States a perpetual easement to construct and operate on the east fire-control station of the fort parapet a navigational light and fog signal with necessary appurtenances, and a perpetual easement to construct and maintain a submarine cable from the water on the southeasterly side of the island to the light and fog-signal apparatus.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Commencing with crops planted for harvest in 1948, for the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance for agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure, or to reinsure insurers of, producers of such agricultural commodities under any plan or plans of insurance determined by the Board to be adapted to any such commodity. Such insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity while in the field due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winterkill, lightning, fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board. Any insurance offered against loss in yield shall not cover in excess of 75 percent of the recorded or appraised average yield of the commodity on the insured farm for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields

fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided*, That, if 75 percent of the average yield represents generally more protection than the investment in the crop in any area, taking into consideration recognized farming practices, the Board shall reduce such maximum percentage so as more nearly to reflect the investment in the crop in such area. Insurance provided under this subsection shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. In 1948 insurance shall be limited to not more than seven crops (including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco) and to not more than three additional crops in each year thereafter. Insurance provided for any agricultural commodity, except wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco, shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 20 counties. Insurance for wheat, corn, and cotton shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 50 counties, and for flax and tobacco to producers in not to exceed 25 counties, for each such commodity. Counties selected by the Board shall be representative of the several areas where the agricultural commodity insured is normally produced. Insurance shall not be provided in any county unless written applications therefor are filed covering at least 200 farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodity; nor shall insurance of any agricultural commodity be provided in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county. The Board may limit or refuse insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved. The Corporation shall report annually to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity insured."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such premiums may be established on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, or on the basis of an average market price designated by the Board."

SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "however," and inserting in lieu thereof "That indemnities may be determined on the same price basis as premiums are determined for the crop with respect to which such indemnities are paid: *Provided further*,".

SEC. 4. Section 502 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance."

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the validity of any insurance contract entered into prior to the enactment of this act insofar as such contract covers the 1947 crop year. Any such contract which purports to cover a crop in the 1948 or any subsequent crop year in any county in which insurance on such crop will be discontinued pursuant to this act is hereby terminated at the end of the 1947 crop year.

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 507 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the subsection and inserting a comma and the following: "except that employees or agencies responsible for administering this

act in each county shall be selected and designated by the Corporation and shall be responsible directly to the Corporation without the intervention of any intermediate office or agency."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Crop Insurance Act and to reduce the program to an experimental basis. My time is limited and I do not care to go into an extended discussion of the present crop-insurance program and the manner in which it has functioned. There has been much criticism of it, it has been badly administered, and there are certain features of the act which I think have made it impossible for it to function as a business proposition. I think everyone who has studied the matter, however, will agree that it is very important to the farmers of this country to give them crop insurance if a system of that kind can be worked out on a business basis. The farmer today is the only businessman who has no opportunity to carry insurance on his business operations.

The committee in reporting the present bill has not only reduced the scope of the coverage by providing that it shall be applicable only to certain crops and to a small number of counties on an experimental basis, but it has also amended the law in a number of particulars in such a way as to make Government crop insurance a businesslike proposition.

I think that if I were to name the principal thing which has made crop insurance a failure in the past I would say it was that the law we had before did not eliminate the moral risk. You cannot have any kind of an insurance program and have it operate successfully if it is more profitable to have a loss than it is not to have a loss. The way the crop-insurance program was set up and the way it has been administered in the past it was on many occasions more profitable to have a loss. That accounts, in my opinion, very largely for the failure of the present program. In this bill we have gotten away from that situation by providing that at no time shall a man's right to insurance exceed his investment in the crop. That does away, I think, with one of the principal causes of the difficulties that we have had in the past in connection with crop insurance.

In addition to that, we have changed the provision of the act which states the purpose so as to put it upon a more businesslike basis. In the original Crop Insurance Act, the language read as follows:

It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by alleviating the economic distress caused by crop failure due to drought and other causes by maintaining the purchasing power of farmers and by pro-

viding for staple supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and the orderly flow thereof in interstate commerce.

That was interpreted and perhaps fairly interpreted by those administering the crop-insurance program as constituting a sort of relief program. That is the way it has been administered during most of the time that it has been in effect. The committee has substituted for that statement of purpose the following language:

It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance.

If I had more time I could point out to you many ways in which the bill has been amended so as to provide for a businesslike administration of this program.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. What crops does this bill cover?

Mr. HOPE. This bill will cover to begin with, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and flax.

Mr. CHELF. Has not your experience been that tobacco has carried its own weight?

Mr. HOPE. Tobacco has been in the experimental program. It has carried its own weight, as the gentleman says. In fact, all the experimental programs that have been tried have not resulted over-all in any losses.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman say what year this covers?

Mr. HOPE. It will go into effect for the crop year 1948.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What do you mean that every one of these crops have carried themselves without loss?

Mr. HOPE. I meant that the premiums collected were sufficient to pay the losses.

Mr. RICH. And carry on the business and keep the capital stock?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 18 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to report to the House very briefly today on the progress of the special committee on publicity and propaganda in the executive agencies, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Our work has been moving along for 3 months. We have published two interim reports on particular phases of Government propaganda activities—one on the operations of the Public Health Service and the Social Security Board in

behalf of socialized medicine in the United States; the other on the activities of the War Department in advocacy of universal military training. I present today only a summary of our work to date, and to acquaint the Members with some of our plans, as now outlined, for the investigations which are to be pressed during the recess.

Over a period of years there has been evident to the Members of this body a growing and sometimes disturbing tendency in the executive branch, to discount or discredit the Members and the legislative actions of the Congress of the United States. It has long been felt by some of us that this unwholesome development was not spontaneous with the people themselves, but grew out of an ever-increasing tendency on the part of the Federal agencies, with their tentacles reaching into practically every county and hamlet, to misuse the funds which have been appropriated to them, to propagandize the people to bring pressure upon Congress for the passage of specialized legislation to perpetuate jobs and ideologies.

Mr. Speaker, I have called attention of the House before, that during the New Deal there was built up in the Federal agencies the highest-priced publicity staff in the world. I said recently it was estimated this Federal publicity organization cost the taxpayers \$75,000,000 a year. Today, I want to tell you, on the basis of investigations by the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, that \$75,000,000 will not approximate the amount being spent for publicity and propaganda by the Federal Government. No one can tell how high the figure goes. No one can tell—for the simple reason that practically every person on the Federal pay roll seems to consider himself an authorized lobbyist—authorized to lobby on Government time—that means the taxpayer's money—for the particular project in which he is interested.

Some of the Federal employees who have been identified in their use of Government time and materials and the Government franking privilege to influence legislation, have indicated surprise that anyone would think they were doing anything wrong. In fact, some of them seemed to conceive it their job to stir up the people with their one-sided propaganda activities, to mislead the people in an effort to get their projects approved by Congress.

One of the most insidious aspects of this type of activity is that when these people go out or write out, propagandizing the people, they presume to speak as Federal officials with the authority of the Federal Government back of them.

Here is the Federal Government speaking against the Federal Congress, or rather—and here is where the propaganda machine is very clever indeed—against an individual or individuals in Congress.

For too many years now the Federal agencies have been led to regard Congress as a rubber stamp to do their every bidding; as a whipping boy to be pounced upon by its publicists and its organized propaganda campaigns, whenever Congress elects to exercise its appointed legislative functions.

Mr. Speaker, that sort of activity must stop.

Because of obvious and flagrant abuses the House of Representatives on May 1 established the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda to investigate such activities on the part of the Federal agencies and their employees.

Although this committee has a very small staff and has been operating only a very short time, it has revealed some shocking things. And preliminary investigations already under way indicate even more shocking disclosures to come.

A major exposure of this committee was the activities of several Federal agencies in attempting to bring pressure upon Congress for the approval of socialized medicine.

The committee found that employees of six agencies arranged a series of so-called health workshop meetings, at which the Federal employees posed as Federal consultants to give the delegates factual information on health questions which might arise at the meetings. Actually, the evidence revealed, the sole purpose of the Federal employees in arranging and attending these meetings was to influence the delegates in favor of socialized medicine.

The manner in which the War Department has been attempting to sell universal military training to the people of this country has also come under consideration by the committee. The committee found that civilians were employed by the Secretary of War for the primary purpose of selling important groups on compulsory military training. In testimony before the committee the Assistant Secretary of War, Howard C. Peterson, testified that the purpose of employing these civilians was "to sell the program to the public, with the hope that the public will sell it to the Congress."

Your subcommittee has received a number of complaints with respect to the activities of county AAA committeemen in propagandizing against reductions in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

In Nebraska, for example, the campaign appears to have been organized and conducted from the State headquarters level, where a form letter was drafted in a meeting of key officials as "suggested material" for the county committeemen. This suggested material was then carried to the county men by the farmer field men in the State.

Evidence at hand indicates the result was a flood of the most brazen propaganda to farm cooperators throughout the State.

After detailing the cuts, a typical letter states:

If this action is sustained by the Senate when they vote on this measure in the near future, it will mean that you as well as all other farmers owning or operating land cannot be paid the full amount of money appearing on the farm plan you may have signed in which you indicated practices to be performed during 1947.

The price-support program will, of course, be curtailed if money for that purpose is not made available, as well as the much-needed soil-erosion control, weed eradication, and farm drainage, the need of which the recent heavy rains have reminded us all very vividly.

The recent congressional action not only affects the immediate status of agriculture,

but may eventually result in economic disaster of agriculture and the Nation in the years ahead.

I want to repeat that. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker—listen to what these people on the Federal pay roll, using Government time and materials, and using the Government frank to send out their propaganda—listen to what they have to say about the attempt of your Appropriations Committee to shave a little money from the Department of Agriculture. I quote again:

The recent congressional action not only affects the immediate status of agriculture but may eventually result in economic disaster of agriculture and the Nation in the years ahead.

Does anyone wonder if Congress has slipped in the estimation of the public when the public receives such statements as that from Federal officials, going out under the Government frank under the guise of official Government business?

But that isn't all. That is by no means all. In fact, it gets worse as it goes on. Listen to this, and I continue to quote:

If price stabilization is denied farmers and no provision is made to protect the land against the damages caused by the elements, history will repeat itself and economic disaster can be the only final result to farmers, business, and labor. Big capitalists and speculators who have inside and advance information may profit by depressions.

Gentlemen, I assure you neither this body nor the Department of Agriculture has heard the last of that. I have told you some of the things our preliminary investigation has revealed. We do not intend to drop it there.

In addition to these investigations, others are under way which I will not mention at this time but which you will hear more about from time to time as our work moves on.

However, I do want to say that our entire committee staff has been instructed to keep a close watch on the propaganda of the State Department in favor of the so-called Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe. We have been advised on good authority that the Department has a well-organized plan to "sell" the Marshall plan to the people during the congressional recess. It is the conception of the State Department at this moment that both the Congress and the public must be educated to a fuller appreciation of what is involved in the Marshall plan. We all agree, of course, that the people are entitled to full knowledge of the Government's foreign policy. But we insist nevertheless that it is not the duty of the Department of State, nor any other executive agency, to tell the people what they ought to think on these grave matters. That's the essential difference between government publicity and Government propaganda. Enlightenment is a proper function; compelling propaganda, such as uses the devices of radio and motion pictures, leaflets, bulletins, pamphlets, and such, is not only disapproved by the conscience of representative government but is positively unlawful.

It has become apparent to your committee that Government propaganda is designed, in most instances, to make the

individual believe he is thinking for himself. In reality, Government propaganda distorts facts, with such authority that the person becomes prejudiced or biased in the direction which the Government propagandists wish to lead national thinking. It is the authority and the supposed objectivity of Government which leads people to accept, without question, the words released by Government officials and agencies. Propaganda in its crudest form appeals to emotion only. Government propaganda is frequently only slanted, but accomplishes the same result. An individual might be wary and critical of material coming from a special interest group. He knows such groups have an ax to grind, but he will consider as gospel truth, if the Government says the identical thing, because he thinks Government officials are impartial.

I have told this body before that in 1 week we measured the total output of the Federal publicity bureaus. The volume of material made about 800 columns of newsprint—more than might have been printed in the average daily paper in 1 week if nothing had been allowed for advertising, cartoons, and editorials.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a representative form of government with the Congress making the laws, this sort of thing must be stopped. Otherwise, the Congress will become in truth a rubber stamp to carry out the whims and vagaries of the undercover propagandists in the Federal agencies.

I for one do not propose to see that happen. Your committee does not propose to see that happen. And I pledge you here and now that the Committee on Publicity and Propaganda will continue its efforts to expose this sort of thing wherever it exists, regardless of the agencies or personalities involved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Who was the author of the communication the gentleman has just quoted from?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have not the letter with me. I have it in my office.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman stated it was a Government official.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. If that is true, the letter indicates that there might be a violation of existing law. My recollection is we have a law which makes it unlawful for a Government official or for a person on the Government pay roll to use the services and the time of the Government in propaganda activities.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. That is section 201, title XVIII, of the Criminal Code.

Mr. COOLEY. I am wondering if the gentleman may not be mistaken and if that might not have originated with some farm organization.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No. That originated in the agricultural office in the State of Nebraska. The committee sent an investigator out there who personally investigated and brought back the facts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made reference to certain letters that were sent around the State of Nebraska. In all fairness it should be said that no doubt there were some farmers and AAA field men who were drawn into something they did not realize was unlawful. I believe I know where those things originated. The Democratic State chairman sent out a telegram to each county containing information that was inaccurate and suggested that they start a propaganda campaign.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are presently considering a bill to carry on Federal crop insurance on an experimental basis. Speaking wholly for myself, I should like to liquidate the program. I am not unmindful of the fact, however, it would be impossible to secure conclusive action in both sides on such a program at this time; consequently I trust that the present bill will be passed and that it can be enacted into law because it will be the only limitation we have on the crop-insurance program.

Now, in this season of the year when baseball is at its zenith you often hear men accost each other and ask "What is the score?" You will be interested in the score on crop insurance as it was disclosed to my subcommittee after extensive hearings. I divided it into two parts, the first part which began with the enactment of so-called crop insurance in June 1938, the second period beginning in 1944.

In the first period we had 5 full crop years when wheat was insured. We had 2 full years of insurance on the cotton crop. The loss on wheat was \$26,312,000; the loss on cotton was \$11,562,000. The administrative expense for that period was \$28,000,000. So, from the first period from 1938 to 1944 the score on crop insurance was a loss to the Federal Treasury, including administrative expenses, of \$66,000,000.

At that time crop insurance was liquidated partly through a modest effort of my own and then was restored in the Senate, so we started once more. We started then on wheat and cotton and in an experimental way on tobacco, flax, and corn. On the latter crops we insured some 16 counties. Here is the score for period No. 2. We make a modest profit of \$6,000,000 on wheat. We took a loss of \$57,000,000 on cotton. Most of that came in one single crop year because the farmers had outguessed the Crop Insurance Corporation. The administrative expense for that period was \$9,000,000. The loss, therefore, was a net \$60,000,000; \$66,000,000 plus \$60,000,000 means a loss of \$126,000,000. It reminds me of the echoes that come back from the discussion on crop insurance on this floor in 1938 when it was said, "Let us try it out; let us make this venture; we are sure that a capital stock of \$100,000,000 will be sufficient to carry out all of

the experimental stage and put it on good grounds." I have lived in my young life to see the day when the entire corporate stock of the crop-insurance program has been liquidated, and in addition thereto there has been an expenditure of \$48,000,000 for administrative expenses.

Now, there are some oddities that have developed. For instance, in five States last year the expense of writing the business exceeded all of the premiums that we got. The field expense ranged from \$4.79 to \$20.78 per contract. No insurance company in the world could stay in business on that basis. I give you a typical example.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the State of Georgia the premiums were \$200,000 plus and the expenses of doing business were \$157,000. We cannot get crop insurance liquidated now, so I suggest to you that at least we adopt a limitation on the program, and the bill before you will place it on an experimental basis, namely, about 20 counties, for most of these crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the appropriation bill contained a continuity for the experimental program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The appropriation bill contained language setting a limitation similar to that carried in the Aiken bill in the Senate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this bill does not become law, will the experimental program continue or will it be stopped?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the program will continue, but on a larger scale than is contemplated in the existing bill, and that is the reason I hope that the present bill will be enacted.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It would seem that any ordinary business concern would do its experimental work first, and thereafter enlarge. We are doing it backward.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that the affairs of government are not always ordinary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Rooney.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the action taken earlier this week by the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill—which is now at the White House—is a signal victory for the

people of the Southwest insofar as the item for Southwestern Power Administration is concerned. The unanimous decision of the conferees guarantees that Norfolk and Denison dams will be tied together as they should by a transmission line, and insures the construction of a substation to be built at Waleetka, Okla., at a cost of \$500,000. Thus the people's dams will remain the properties of the people—not the properties of the private utilities and their powerful lobby.

The unexpended funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 are continued available during the fiscal year 1948 and whether work has been physically started before June 30, 1947, or not, are made available for the construction of necessary interconnecting facilities incident to and connected with the construction of the Denison-Norfolk transmission line. Thus the competent administrator of Southwestern Power Administration, Douglas Wright, has sufficient moneys to carry on his commendable work for the people of the Southwest in the fiscal year 1948 and to cause electricity to be brought to many more of the farms of that portion of our great country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to follow this crop-insurance program for the last 3 or 4 years. You heard the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that up until 1943 we squandered \$66,280,000 on this program. At that time we had given them only \$30,000,000 of capital stock. Then they asked for an appropriation for \$40,000,000 more. At that time, because of the record they had made, I objected very strenuously to granting any more money to this organization. I not only fought that bill when it was on the floor of the House, but after the bill was passed I made up my mind that I would try my best as a Member of Congress to follow it through, and if possible make it successful, and stop the waste of Government funds. I wrote a letter to Marvin Jones, who was then War Food Administrator, and gave him my ideas on how that ought to be operated, and suggested he keep his eye on this organization. He replied that if it later did not prove out more satisfactorily than it had in the beginning, he would do his utmost to see that it was discontinued.

I then wrote a letter to Mr. Wright, who was then chairman of this corporation, and asked him the names of the people whom he would propose to operate it and their responsibility and experience in business. Mr. Wright gave me a reply, and also came to my office several times and discussed the Federal crop-insurance program with me. At that time he said he was having some men come from Chicago to try to assist them in making this plan work. That was in 1944.

Since that time they have lost every dollar that has been put into this program, every dollar of the capital stock, which amounted to \$100,000,000. They spent over \$50,000,000 in administration of the program. They made a profit of \$8,000,000 on wheat and they lost that.

All the premiums they received during the time crop insurance was in effect, and I do not know how many millions of dollars that was, have been lost. It continually lost, lost, lost. It is one of the most colossal instances of poor legislation and poor business I have ever known or had ever experienced. So I came to the conclusion that I would do everything I could to see that the Federal crop insurance was put out of business. I have not had any success in putting it out of business, because the Committee on Agriculture now comes in with this bill to carry insurance for crops on as an experiment. As was said a while ago, we are experimenting at the wrong end of this organization. It should have had its experimentation way back in 1939. But you are not through with this yet. It will be a great loss, I feel sure, as long as you go.

I asked the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether, if this experiment did not prove out successfully in 2 years, he would use his influence to close it up. He and other members of the Committee on Agriculture said if they could not make a successful venture out of it in 2 years it ought to be closed up. I hope they are going to carry that out.

This situation has been dreadfully bad. To think that we had a man in there for 3 or 4 years who squandered all this money. I went to see the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, just recently. I asked him where Mr. Wright was. He said, "He is not here now. There is somebody else who is going to have charge of this Federal crop insurance program." So I tried to find out where Mr. Wright was and I had quite a time locating him. I thought there was something wrong, so I sent for Mr. Wright. I located him down here in Alexandria. Finally, I got him in the office. I found out, but I did not find out from him, that Mr. Anderson showed him the gate and told him to get out. Well, Mr. Anderson did a good thing when he showed Mr. Wright the gate because anybody who could see a corporation run for this length of time and the great losses, ought to get the gate. Crop insurance as administered was inefficient, poor judgment, poor management, and it was not insurance but dishonest business as operated.

I hope you will vote for this resolution as bad as it is. We will have to take it and think it is a good thing just because it will stop the business as previously operated and certainly this bill will not be as bad as previously conducted. I shall vote for this improvement but if I could vote to eliminate the Federal Crop Insurance program altogether I would do so.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the time I have to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is anything I can add to the discussion of this

legislation. Of course, I have followed it for the last 8 years. I do want to point out that there seems to be one crop that this insurance particularly applies to, and that crop is tobacco. A tobacco crop is just a little bit different from any other crop because of the fact that a man usually has only a very small acreage. His whole yearly earnings are wrapped up in half an acre, an acre, or a few acres of tobacco.

Following the reports through the years and with all the bad records that we have had here today, those statements do not apply to tobacco.

As to the others, that is water under the dam. There is no use rehashing that. We know it has been maladministered. I think everyone admits that. It is regrettable that this crop-insurance program, though started as a program ended up in the class of a racket. But I do think from the standpoint of tobacco, if we did not go any further than that, we should carry this on for at least another year or two to see if we cannot set up some yardstick so far as the tobacco insurance for tobacco is concerned.

This legislation under consideration today, if carefully administered, will determine whether national crop insurance should be a permanent policy or whether it should be discontinued once and for all.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3465 is not new legislation. It is restrictive or a limitation on the present law as it is now written.

DIFFICULTIES WITH FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Contributing to the difficulties of this first Federal experiment in crop insurance was the background against which the legislation was enacted. The Nation had just passed through the disastrous drought years. Farmers in many parts of the country were reeling under the impact of the double blows of economic and natural disaster. They desperately needed assistance. The decision to undertake the writing of crop insurance on a Nation-wide scale, instead of on a limited experimental basis such as the course of prudence would have dictated, must be regarded as partially an effort to bring relief to farmers who were in critical need of it. As such, it served its purpose—and probably did so as equitably and at as little cost to the Federal Treasury as any other method would have done. But such a purpose was not conducive to the development of an actuarially sound system of insurance.

Inherent also in that crop insurance effort was the defect of its conception as part of the ever-normal granary. The commodities received as premium payments or purchased in the hedging operation, it was believed, would add to the supplies in the granary and contribute to the stabilization of agricultural prices—this apparently without realizing fully the cost of administering and storing such supplies and the effect the accumulated surpluses themselves would have in overriding and depressing the

very market they were designed to support.

Against this background Federal crop insurance got under way with the wheat crop of 1939; and for five successive years the indemnities paid exceeded the premiums collected, despite the fact that some of the years were excellent wheat-crop years for the country as a whole. In 1942 insurance was offered on cotton, pursuant to an amendment to the act, and for 2 years losses were sustained on cotton insurance, despite two good cotton crops.

By 1943 agriculture was well into the era of high wartime prices, emergency relief measures were no longer necessary, and crop insurance was terminated with the 1943 crop. The losses on wheat had total \$26,312,000; on cotton, \$11,430,000, plus an administrative expenditure of \$28,438,000.

THE REINSTITATED PROGRAM

There was still, however, the almost universal feeling that farmers are entitled to the stability resulting from insurance of their crops against losses from causes beyond their control, if such insurance could be developed on a sound basis—and that the brief period of semi-insurance, semi-relief activity from 1939 to 1943 had not given the program a fair trial. Accordingly, the decision to abandon the effort to develop crop insurance was reconsidered, and in December 1944 Congress reinstated the program. Some refinements and adjustments were made, in the light of the previous experience; but, on the whole, the scope of the wheat and cotton programs were not changed, and flax was added as a commodity on which general insurance was to be offered. Corn and tobacco were included but limited to 20 representative counties for each community. The results of this second phase of operations is shown in the following table:

Crop insurance—gain or loss from insurance operation, crop years 1945 and 1946

	1945	1946 ¹
Wheat.....	+ \$828,552.73	+ \$5,446,536.71
Cotton.....	- 15,243,622.30	- 41,620,044.02
Flax.....	+ 574,191.57	- 566,240.25
Corn:		
Yield.....	- 284,691.86	- 6,149.00
Investment.....	+ 24,801.29	+ 47,599.24
Tobacco.....	+ 148,949.02	+ 568,700.00

¹ Estimated.

NOTE.—Plus (+) indicates gain; minus (−) indicates loss.

With the exception of cotton, the results in terms of gain or loss during the past 2 years have not been too unsatisfactory. The losses on cotton, however, are not such as can be countenanced in a sound insurance program, and there is no present assurance that a similar situation will not develop with regard to wheat if the current cycle of exceptionally favorable wheat years should suddenly end. To put it briefly, the committee believes that the present crop-insurance program is, on the whole, neither sound insurance nor profitable experimentation.

DEVELOPMENT A LONG-TIME PROJECT

The committee believes it should be recognized that the development of a sound crop-insurance program covering

even the major agricultural commodities on a Nation-wide basis is a long-time project that may well take years in its accomplishment. It has taken many years, the experience and intelligence of many individuals, and the investment and loss of millions of dollars to develop other forms of casualty insurance to the sound position they now occupy. In the course of that development, hundreds of insurance companies were formed and went bankrupt, hundreds of types of insurance were tried and found wanting, and millions of individual investors and policy holders ventured and lost their own money in the trial and error experiments which eventually contributed to the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In crop insurance, at least, those who could least afford it—the policyholders who thought they had purchased protection—have not been required to foot the whole bill for the national experiment.

If crop insurance is to succeed in the United States, it must fulfill two basic requirements: First, it must be sound from a business standpoint—capable of "paying its own way" and operating without loss to the Government; second, it must offer farmers a type of insurance they want and are willing and able to pay for.

FARMERS ENTITLED TO EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The committee believes that it is possible eventually to write crop insurance that will meet both these basic qualifications. It does not believe that this can be accomplished overnight nor that it is reasonable to expect that a half-dozen crop seasons of experience will achieve for crop insurance what it took other forms of commodity insurance many years of trial and error to develop. The committee is convinced, however, that the best interests of farmers themselves will be most truly served if the Public Treasury is protected against excessive loss, by curtailment of the insurance program during its development period to the smallest scale consistent with effective experimentation, and expanding it later only when experience has indicated that a sound insurance plan has been worked out.

The committee has, therefore, prepared this bill, H. R. 3465, placing the crop-insurance program on a strictly experimental basis and providing the Crop Insurance Corporation with the latitude of operation and the authority which it believes to be necessary to the carrying out of a truly experimental program. The details of the proposed program are explained in the analysis of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that much can be gained by trying to place responsibility for the losses on crop insurance in the past. I think an investigation would disclose that there are many different sources to blame.

I do want to express the hope that some way can be found to bring some degree of security to those people who provide the food and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation. I have said before and I would like to repeat now that it seems to me the people who work in the

field, who work in the sun and produce the food to feed the remainder of the Nation are entitled to that same degree of security and protection as is now enjoyed by the people who eat that food. Is that not fundamental?

I hope that some way can be found out of this experiment whereby we can bring to the people on the farms some protection against the hazards they must bear today. I think that the pending bill will greatly improve the program.

I would like to refer briefly to some of the measures provided in this bill which should save the Government the enormous losses which have been mentioned here.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield briefly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to make this observation. The gentleman from Georgia now addressing us, as well as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, have both been energetic in taking every step for the welfare of the people who live and work on our farms.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. In regard to cotton insurance, does that extend to all varieties of cotton, long fiber as well as short?

Mr. PACE. It extends to all varieties and in all areas. When the experimental program is put into operation, the purpose will be to select a county here and a county there which, when selected, will be completely representative of the production of cotton throughout the Nation.

I would like to state some of the changes which are being made and which I think will prevent future losses.

This bill limits the farmer's recovery under his policy to not exceeding his investment. So no more can there be the possibility of a producer abandoning his crop and trying to make a profit on his insurance.

Secondly, it eliminates insurance in any county where there are not at least 200 farms, or one-third of the farmers under the program. This should eliminate a great deal of expense.

Third, and very important, for the first time we give the Board the right to refuse to write farmers on the basis of risk. Heretofore the Corporation was required to insure a crop, regardless of the reputation, the background, or the moral risk of the farmer. The Corporation states that this has contributed in good measure to its losses.

Fourth, and I think this is equally important, this bill gives the Corporation the right to hire and fire and direct its own employees. I know many of you will be surprised to learn that up to this time the Corporation did the insuring but another agency of the Department of Agriculture provided all of the employees to administer the program out in the field. The consequence has been to have a business organization trying to put the program on a business basis but with no authority to select its employees.

Lastly, and also important, heretofore and hereafter all premiums may be paid in the commodity; that is, if you insure a wheat crop, you can pay your premium in wheat. But to save itself from heavy

losses due to changes in price the Corporation has been required to buy an amount of wheat equal to the premiums and keep it in storage. This has been very expensive. Under this bill the Corporation is authorized to establish premiums on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity insured, or on the basis of an average market price, and then to determine indemnities on the same price basis as the premiums are determined. This should result in great savings and greatly improve the program.

I ask your approval of this bill, and I sincerely hope that through these experimental programs we can find sound means and methods of soon setting up a Nation-wide, all-commodity insurance program for the protection of our agricultural producers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish that this bill had been brought before the House under a rule which would enable more time for debate. This matter is an important one. The farmers of America are interested in Federal Crop Insurance. The bill contains necessary amendments to the Federal Crop Insurance Act. I think these amendments will revitalize the program and will enable a greater number of farmers of America to participate in this Federal crop insurance program.

For many years, almost every member of the economic family of the Nation, has been able to insure against accidental loss of the commodity he deals with, except the farmer. The idea of protecting the farmer against accidental loss or destruction of his products is a sound one. The law with these amendments will, I believe, be put on a sound basis. Insurance generally is comparatively new, but it has been fully applied to the protection of every commodity except the crops grown by farmers. Many years ago, efforts were made to provide crop insurance but the first real effort came in the act of February 1938. However, the program has been carried out on a hit and miss basis and it has never had the backing from Congress it deserves.

This bill undertakes to place the act on a sound basis which will eventually pay its own way without loss to the Government and it proposes to offer farmers a type of insurance which they want and which they are willing to pay for. I think the Committee on Agriculture has done a splendid service to the farmers of the Nation in reporting this measure and I hope that it may be passed through both Houses of Congress during this session.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

XCIII—645

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment and request a conference with the Senate and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, FLANNAGAN, and COOLEY.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MARINE BAND AUTHORIZED TO ATTEND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT NEW YORK AND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4247) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1633) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947, may be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and perform in the parade of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., on August 30, 1947, and to attend and perform in the parade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Cleveland, Ohio, on a date between September 4 to 9, 1947, to be selected by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and performing in such parades, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed \$6 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowances to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 4247) were laid on the table.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION; CANCELLATION OF CAPITAL STOCK AND REFUND OF MONEYS RECEIVED FOR SUCH STOCK

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to retire its capital stock by paying the amount received therefor (whether received from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks) to the Secretary of the Treasury as hereinafter provided, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary so much of its capital and surplus as is in excess of \$1,000,000,000. The balance of the amount to be paid to the Secretary shall be paid in units of \$10,000,000 except that the last unit to be paid may be less than \$10,000,000. Each unit shall be paid as soon as it may be paid without reducing the capital and surplus of the Corporation below \$1,000,000,000. As each payment is made a corresponding amount of the capital stock of the Corporation shall be retired and canceled and the receipt or certificate therefor shall be surrendered or endorsed to show such cancellation. The stock subscribed by the various Federal Reserve banks shall be retired and canceled, pro rata, before the stock subscribed by the Secretary is retired and canceled.

SEC. 2. Section 12B (d) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (d)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 12B (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (b)), is amended by striking out "\$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000."

SEC. 4. Section 12B (c) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate \$3,000,000,000. For such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this section shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

Sec. 5. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5c of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 606a (b) and (c)), are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "\$12,500" and insert "\$15,000."

Page 3, line 7, after the figures "\$3,000,000" insert "outstanding at any one time: *Provided*, That the rate of interest to be charged in connection with any loan made pursuant to this paragraph shall not be less than the current average rate on outstanding marketable and nonmarketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such loan."

Page 3, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 4, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGIONAL DISBURSING OFFICERS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 907) to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 249b), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in case of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer or any regional disbursing officer of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, the accounts of such Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer may be continued and payments made in his name by an Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or by an assistant regional disbursing officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or designated by

an official of the Treasury Department authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury to make such designation, for a period of time not to extend beyond the last day of the second month following the month in which such death, resignation, or separation shall occur. Such accounts and payments shall be allowed, audited, and settled in the General Accounting Office, and the checks signed in the name of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer shall be honored by the Treasurer of the United States, in the same manner as if the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer had continued in office. The former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer, his estate, or the surety on his official bond, shall not be subject to any legal liability or penalty for the official acts and defaults of the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or assistant regional disbursing officer acting in the name or in the place of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer under this act, but the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or the assistant regional disbursing officer, and his surety, shall be responsible therefor under his bond. The bond of the Acting Chief Disbursing Officer or acting regional disbursing officer shall be an amount at least equal to the minimum amount of the bond required of the Chief Disbursing Officer or the regional disbursing officer, respectively. The Secretary of the Treasury may, from time to time, require the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer, or the assistant regional disbursing officer, to renew and increase his bond to the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "designated" and insert the word "designation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4168) to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, as of the date of enactment of this act, created as an agency of the United States of America a body corporate with the name of "The Institute of Inter-American Affairs" (in this act called the "Institute").

SEC. 2. The purposes of this corporation are to further the general welfare of, and to strengthen friendship and understanding among, the peoples of the American Republics through collaboration with other governments and governmental agencies of the American Republics in planning, initiating, assisting, financing, administering, and executing technical programs and projects, especially in the fields of public health, sanitation, agriculture, and education.

SEC. 3. The Institute, as a corporation—
(a) Shall have succession for a period of 5 years unless sooner dissolved by an act of Congress.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May make and perform contracts with any individual, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, whether within or without the United States of America,

and with any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign.

(d) Shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid.

(e) May, as necessary for the transaction of the business of the Institute, employ officers, employees, agents, and attorneys in accordance with the provisions of the civil service and classification laws, except that the Institute may, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, employ, and fix the compensation of, officers, employees, agents, and attorneys of the Institute employed for service outside the continental limits of the United States: *Provided*, That the salary of any person thus employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the classification laws, and that the Institute may require bonds of any employee and pay the premiums of such bonds: *Provided further*, That no person who is a citizen of the United States not presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) for service in any American Republic of which such person is not a citizen except with the specific approval of the Government of the American Republic concerned.

(f) May acquire by purchase, devise, bequest, or gift, or otherwise, lease, hold, and improve such real and personal property as it finds to be necessary to its purposes, whether within or without the United States, and in any manner dispose of all such real and personal property held by it and use as general funds all receipts arising from the disposition of such property.

(g) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government.

(h) May, with the consent of any board, corporation, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(i) May accept money, funds property, and services of every kind by gift, devise or bequest, or grant, or otherwise, and make advances and grants to any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, whether within or without the United States of America, or to any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign, when deemed advisable by the Institute in furtherance of its purposes.

(j) May sue and be sued, complain, and defend, in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(k) Shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out its powers and duties under this act.

SEC. 4. Upon termination of the corporate life of the Institute all of its functions shall be liquidated and, thereafter, unless otherwise provided by Congress, the assets shall be transferred to the United States Treasury as the property of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) The management of the Institute shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") of not less than five in number, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary of State from among the officials and employees of the Department of State and, in the discretion of the Secretary of State and with the consent of the chiefs of other departments or agencies respectively concerned from among the officials and employees of other United States Government departments and agen-

cies: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed as a director under authority of this paragraph (a) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) The Secretary of State shall designate one director as Chairman of the Board.

(c) The directors shall hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary of State.

(d) The directors shall receive no additional compensation for their services as directors but may be allowed actual necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as directors.

(e) The Board shall direct the exercise of all the powers of the Institute.

(f) The Board may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which the business of the Institute may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed: *Provided*, That a majority of this Board shall be required as a quorum.

(g) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred upon it, the Board may appoint such committees for the carrying out of the work of the Institute as the Board finds to be for the best interests of the Institute, each committee to consist of two or more of the directors, which committees, together with officers and agents duly authorized by the Board and to the extent provided by the Board, shall have and may exercise the powers of the Board in the management of the business and affairs of the Institute.

SEC. 6. The Institute shall be a nonprofit corporation and shall have no capital stock. No part of its revenue, earnings, or other income or property shall inure to the benefit of its directors, officers, and employees and such revenue, earnings, or other income, or property shall be used for the carrying out of the corporate purposes herein set forth. No director, officer, or employee of the corporation shall in any manner directly or indirectly participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or organization in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

SEC. 7. When approved by the Institute, in furtherance of its purposes, the officers and employees of the Institute may accept and hold offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with governments or governmental agencies of the other American Republics.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of State shall have authority to detail employees of the Department of State to the Institute under such circumstances and upon such conditions as he may determine: *Provided*, That any such employee so detailed shall not lose any privileges, rights, or seniority as an employee of the Government by virtue of such detail.

SEC. 9. The principal office of the Institute shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies, branch offices, or other offices in any place or places within the United States or the other American Republics in any of which locations the Institute may carry on all or any of its operations and business under bylaws or rules and regulations.

SEC. 10. The Institute, including its franchise and income, shall be exempt from taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

SEC. 11. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operations to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy

in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

SEC. 12. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., two Government corporations caused to be created under the laws of the State of Delaware on March 31, 1942, and September 25, 1943, respectively, by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, shall, within 10 days following the enactment of this act, transfer to the corporation created by this act all necessary personnel, the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all rights, privileges, and powers subject to all restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations, and the corporation created by this act, shall accept full title to and ownership of all the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all rights, privileges, and powers subject to the said restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations and all such debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties of the two said corporations shall henceforth attach to the corporation created by this act and may be enforced against it to the same extent as if said debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties had been incurred or contracted by the corporation created by this act: *Provided*, That all citizens of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., and transferred under authority of this section 12 to the corporation created by this act shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., for service in an American Republic of which such person is not a citizen, and transferred under authority of this section 12, shall be retained in such service for a period exceeding three months from the date of enactment of this act except with the specific approval of the government of the American Republic concerned.

SEC. 13. The Institute shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Cong.).

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated, at a rate not to exceed \$5,000,000 annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

This act may be cited as the "Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what his understanding is as to the intent on the part of the State Department for these Inter-American corporations? When this bill came up on the Consent Calendar the other day I requested another Member to ask that it be passed over, which was done.

In the Appropriations Committee it is our general understanding that these activities are to be liquidated as of June 30, 1948, which leads me to believe there is little reason for the extension of these corporations. The gentleman's bill attempts to give them 5 years new life. He has agreed to 3 years instead of 5. But I would like it to be explicitly understood that there is not to be any initiation of new contracts, programs, involving commitment of this Government beyond the present commitments on the part of the United States.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman means beyond June 30, 1948?

Mr. PLOESER. I have not any objection to the period of liquidation or even an additional supervisory period. But this attempt amounts to committing us to new programs. All of these programs have an expiration date prior to June 30, 1948.

Mr. JONKMAN. This is a Government-owned corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware. In December 1945, the Government passed the Government Corporation Decentralization Act which provided that after June 30, 1948 all of these corporations incorporated under State law should cease to operate as agencies of the United States. That is the statute that is affecting the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It is not the action of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PLOESER. Of course, that is not the question. The question is, do they intend to institute any new programs beyond those which they are now completing?

Mr. JONKMAN. My understanding is that they do not intend to institute any programs after 1948. There may be minor ones within the period through 1948.

Mr. PLOESER. They testified before us that these programs are expiring and a liquidation period as far as financial assistance beyond 1948 is concerned is not needed, that in the main it may take some time into the fiscal year 1949 to wipe out all of the commitments we have as of the present day. This looks like a chance for the camel to get its nose under the tent and make new commitments for additional programs.

Mr. JONKMAN. Some of these programs take 2, 3, 4, or 5 years. There are some that are not completed and will not be completed perhaps by June 30, 1948.

Mr. PLOESER. It is not the gentleman's intention that they initiate any new programs?

Mr. JONKMAN. It is my understanding they will not.

Mr. PLOESER. That is the gentleman's intention. The gentleman's intention and my intention is that they shall not.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 2, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "five" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN BOISE, IDAHO

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1505) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what kind of land is this?

Mr. GOFF. It is some lots that the Chamber of Commerce of Boise conveyed to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of building an office for the Forest Service. The lots were not used for that purpose. The building was not constructed, and now this bill seeks to reconvey the lots to the Boise Chamber of Commerce. They were conveyed to the Federal Government for the sum of \$1. The bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. RICH. Will the chamber of commerce give the \$1 back?

Mr. GOFF. Yes. It provides that they shall pay the same price as the Government paid for it.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Boise Chamber of Commerce, Boise, Idaho, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lots one to nine, inclusive, in block two of Riverside Park addition to Boise City, Ada County, Idaho.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL PERMANENT MAJOR GENERALS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2993) to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent major generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States: Edward P. King, Jr.; William F. Sharp; George F. Moore; George M. Parker, Jr.; and Albert M. Jones.

SEC. 2. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Army of the United States: Clifford Bluemel, James R. N. Weaver, Maxon S. Lough, William E. Brougner, Joseph P. Vachon, Charles C. Drake, Bradford G. Chynoweth, Clinton A. Pierce, Arnold J. Funk, Lewis C. Beebe, and Kearle L. Berry.

SEC. 3. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Luther R. Stevens, an officer of the Philippine Constabulary, serving as a temporary brigadier general in the Philippine Army, as a permanent brigadier general of the line of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. Effective as of the date of his relief from active duty, Carl H. Seals, a retired

officer of the Regular Army serving on active duty as a temporary brigadier general in the Army of the United States, shall be advanced on the retired list of the Regular Army to the grade of brigadier general, and shall receive the retired pay provided by law for officers retired in that grade.

SEC. 5. Any persons appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall be additional general officers of the line of the Regular Army in the grades to which so appointed and shall not be counted for the purposes of provisions of law establishing the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army. Nothing in this act shall be deemed permanently to increase the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army or to authorize the appointment in the grade of general officer of the line of any successor to any such person.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 2, line 9, strike out the word "and" after the first comma, and before the period, insert the words "and William P. Morse."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 609) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Normal Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims against the United States arising out of the deaths of Normal Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris, late of Hope, Ark., who were killed April 15, 1944, at Hope, Ark., by the explosion of a 37-millimeter shell of the type used by the United States Army.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable for damages and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2389, an act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, with a Senate amendment

thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENNINGS, SPRINGER, and KEAN.

A. E. MCCARTNEY ET AL.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 629) entitled "An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart," do pass with the following Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "\$3,688.69", insert "the sum of \$930.75 to Joseph Natali, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co., and the sum of \$1,004.06 to J. E. Fournier, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and others."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 26, 27, 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,388,266,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In

lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,549,755,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,170,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$154,032,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$83,299,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$699,646,960"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$374,055,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$82,474,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$829,272,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$430,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$69,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$129,386,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$191,353,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$320,739,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$245,532,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,890,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$134,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$67,823,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$43,039,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 16, 19, 21, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVEY TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$2,388,286,700 for "Pay of the Army" instead of \$2,348,438,179 as proposed by the House and \$2,423,813,129 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$21,469,000 for "Finance service, Finance Department," instead of \$20,160,650 as proposed by the House and \$22,806,563, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Corrects total for the "Finance Service, Army."

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$7,170,500 for "Welfare of enlisted men, Quartermaster Corps," instead of \$6,777,141 as proposed by the House and \$7,610,619 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$78,559,860 for "Regular supplies of the Army" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$70,059,860 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$154,032,900 for "Clothing and equipage" instead of \$153,834,336 as proposed by the House and \$154,330,688 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$83,299,300 for "Incidental expenses of the Army" instead of \$78,530,058 as proposed by the House and \$88,430,042 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Corrects total for the "Quartermaster Service, Army."

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$374,055,100 for "Transportation service, Army," instead of \$347,577,227 as proposed by the House and \$392,633,443 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$82,474,900 for "Signal Service, Army," instead of \$79,128,895 as proposed by the House and \$85,475,501 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$829,272,100 for the "Air Corps, Army," instead of \$773,332,508 as proposed by the House and \$858,443,591 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Authorizes contract authorization of \$43,000,000 for "Air Corps, Army," instead of \$280,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$497,490,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$69,534,000 for the "Medical and Hospital Department" instead of \$69,153,267 as proposed by the House and \$70,049,458 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$129,386,000 for "Engineer Service, Army," instead of \$114,512,405 as proposed by the House and \$145,456,441 as proposed by the Senate. The \$10,800,000 recommended by the Senate for requirements due to the new policy of treating as liberated nations certain countries heretofore treated as occupied is not included in the approved amount. This action by the conferees is not intended to prevent a request for a deficiency for this purpose later in the year upon proper justifications.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$191,353,000 for "Barracks and quarters, Army," instead of \$184,702,101 as proposed by the House and \$197,896,261 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Corrects a total for "Engineer Service, Army."

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$245,532,800 for "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," instead of \$244,381,771 as proposed by the House and \$247,024,041 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$19,890,300 for "Chemical Service, Army," instead of \$19,240,936 as proposed by the House and \$20,487,813 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$134,000,000 for the "National Guard" instead of \$110,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$136,535,176 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$67,823,900 for the "Organized Reserves" instead of \$54,975,816 as proposed by the House and \$80,681,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$25,025,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$24,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Increases the limitation on "Clerical services" to \$82,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$303,500 for the "Promotion of rifle practice," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$281,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Adjusts the funds to be transferred by the Secretary of War for employment of additional personnel at the

seat of government and elsewhere to \$43,039,100.

Amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 36: Eliminates the provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the transfer of not to exceed 5 percent between appropriations.

TITLE II—SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSIONS

Amendments Nos. 37 to 92, inclusive: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 11, pertaining to contract authorization for the "Signal Service of the Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to \$5,000,000 instead of \$11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16, pertaining to contract authorization "Engineer Service, Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to \$2,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19. Eliminates the House language pertaining to the sale of scrap or salvage material under "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," and substitutes therefor clarifying language as follows:

"Provided, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, not more than \$25,000,000 of the amounts received by the War Department during the fiscal year 1948 as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material shall be available for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and materiel: *Provided further*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress;"

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 21, pertaining to contract authorization "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to \$2,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24, pertaining to contract authorization for the National Guard. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to \$15,000,000 instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive, under "General provisions," clarifying House language pertaining to the application of personnel ceilings governing personnel employed by other agencies but performing work for the War Department. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

TITLE II—SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSIONS

Amendments Nos. 37 to 92, inclusive, provide for the rescission of certain appropriations made for the fiscal year 1940 through 1946 in the revised amount of \$1,438,966,500. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Estab-

lishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is the War Department military appropriation bill. The original budget estimate was \$5,716,791,500. The House reduced this \$435,809,000, or to \$5,280,000,000. The Senate restored \$335,636,376, or all of the House cut but \$100,000,000. In the conference the House receded on \$201,000,000 and the Senate on \$134,000,000, leaving the bill \$234,261,000 below the budget estimate.

The bill as it left the House had \$280,000,000 in contract authorizations. The Senate increased these contract authorizations to \$543,490,000. The conference reduced it to \$454,000,000 or a reduction of \$89,490,000. There was a supplemental estimate for airplanes on this contract authorization of \$103,000,000. The Senate added \$34,000,000 new money because of the increased cost of gasoline. This is over and above the budget. The conference agreed to \$24,000,000, or \$10,000,000 below the amount put in by the Senate.

As to increases for various other items, the National Guard was increased \$26,535,000, the Organized Reserves \$25,000,000, the ROTC \$25,000,000. The total increase on these last items by the Senate was \$52,942,000, that is, over and above the budget estimate, and the conference agreed to \$37,900,000, a reduction of approximately \$15,000,000. There were other items, the conversion of vessels, and so forth, on which the Senate added \$20,856,000, and we restored \$8,000,000 finally. In other words, the new money added by the Senate was \$108,000,000, and the conferees restored \$73,000,000, or a reduction of \$35,000,000.

When the bill went to the Senate it contained a reduction of 74,806 civilian employees. The Senate restored 35,204 of the 74,806. The conferees reduced this number and agreed to put back 16,435 employees, leaving a net reduction in the number of employees of 58,371, instead of 74,806.

The House took out \$184,086,216 for the civilian employees, and the Senate restored \$86,803,000. The conferees agreed on a restoration of a net sum of \$41,200,000, leaving a net savings on civilian employees of approximately \$143,000,000.

Of the officers, that is, not including nurses or warrant officers, the House provided in the original bill for a total number of 132,500. The House reduced this by 17,500, leaving 115,000. The Senate restored 10,000. The conferees agreed on a restoration of 5,000, leaving the Army with 120,000 officers, making a reduction of 12,500.

There was a reduction of 2,600 warrant officers. The Senate restored all of

them, and we finally agreed to a reduction of about 650 at a saving of \$2,500,000.

I think that covers the picture pretty well.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has made a very comprehensive statement and I am in full accord with him. The members of the conference committee of the House and Senate did a good job, and I think we have a bill that the House will be satisfied with.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a member of the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I think the significance of the conference report can be realized by a brief reference to four features in what was done.

Those four features would be: One, what we did with respect to civilian employees of the War Department; two, what we did with respect to officers; three, what we did with respect to the Air Force; and, four, what we did with respect to the National Guard.

First. With respect to civilian employees, in the bill that the House passed the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department made reductions ranging from 5 percent to 25 percent in the number of civilian employees requested by the various branches of the War Department. The Senate restored those reductions in many instances 100 percent and in some instances not that much. The conference agreement on the civilian employees so far as the zone of the interior is concerned was to allow 50 percent of the Senate restoration. With respect to civilian employees overseas, the House bill originally made a straight reduction of 10 percent. The Senate restored the full 10 percent of that reduction. The conference agreement retained 60 percent of that 10-percent reduction originally voted by the House. In many of the zones overseas foreign nationals are available. This action refers to nationals of the United States who are civilian employees.

Mr. DURHAM. Can the gentleman give us the final figures on the Air Forces?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will be glad to do that as item three.

Second, with respect to officers, when the bill passed the House we made a reduction of about \$96,000,000 in the officers, both commissioned and warrant officers. The Senate restored \$55,000,000 for commissioned officers and \$10,000,000 for warrant officers. The conference agreement restores \$35,000,000, of which \$27,500,000 is for commissioned officers and \$7,500,000 for warrant officers. This means a saving of \$60,000,000 from the original budget estimate and the conferees believe ample officer strength is provided, especially keeping in mind the fact that we have a great pool of well-trained experienced Reserve officers at this time.

It should also be borne in mind that during our deliberations on the bill, the War Department brought before us a

revised table of organization which reduced money requirements. The committee was not satisfied in our hearings with the showing of the War Department on officer distribution. They had 20,000 majors as against 6,000 first lieutenants and 4,000 second lieutenants, and 6,000 colonels. Obviously, that was wholly out of balance. In the revised table they brought before us they reduced the ratios of colonels and majors and made an increase in the lower grades.

Now, third, with respect to the Air Force and its planes. Members of the House will recall that when the bill left the House we provided \$400,000,000 in cash for the procurement of airplanes and \$280,000,000 contract authorization. Both of those items were stepped up by the other body.

One reason was that the cost of airplanes had gone up from the time the estimates were originally prepared. As I recall the figures, the Senate added \$4,000,000 in cash for procurement of airplane spare parts and raised the contract authorizations from \$280,000,000 to \$497,000,000. The conferees agreed upon the cash and \$430,000,000 in contract authorizations for the procurement of airplanes and things that go with them.

The total cash money for the Air Forces, as provided by the conference agreement, is \$829,000,000, as compared with \$773,000,000 proposed by the House and \$858,000,000 proposed by the Senate. I have used round figures. Much of the increase in cash is to cover increased costs of gasoline.

Fourth, with respect to the National Guard. When the bill passed the House we did not cut the budget estimates for the National Guard. We gave the War Department every dollar that was requested for the National Guard. We were happy to find in our conference with the other body that the opinion of the Members of the Senate was in accord with the feeling of the Members of the House on the importance of the National Guard. They gave them not merely the budget estimate, but they gave them a considerable increase over the request of the budget. The final action on the National Guard gives them \$24,000,000 more than the House figure. There was a general feeling by the conferees on both sides that in the present world situation it is important that the National Guard be kept in a position where the Reserve officers in the Guard will get the training they should have to keep them up to date, and to make them available should an emergency ever arise.

These four features I have mentioned may help Members to interpret the action taken on this important part of the national economy.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. How many planes are provided for in the appropriation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In our discussions in the conference we did not deal in numbers of airplanes but in terms of millions of pounds of aircraft. The fact that we did not make the authorization in numbers of planes is because discretion is left with the War Depart-

ment as to the types of planes they will procure.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Will the gentleman tell me briefly about the constituted Reserve officers?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman have in mind the Organized Reserves as distinguished from the National Guard?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The conference agreement on the Organized Reserves appropriates \$67,828,900 for the Organized Reserves as compared with \$54,975,000 proposed by the House, and \$80,661,000 proposed by the Senate.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 23, line 13, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of \$11,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to say just one word further to what I have said previously. This was a conference that it was anticipated would be a very difficult conference. I want to express my personal appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee, and for the work of the other conferees. I felt that we went into a difficult conference, but we found that working on it for the last couple of days we were able to reach a complete agreement. I believe that saves time for the House and really speaks for the unity of opinion when we are dealing with questions of national defense.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$5,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 29, line 1, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of \$5,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman did probably as much as anybody could with the Senate in this bill. The gentleman

simply does not think there is a possible chance of holding the bill down, but that we have got to make these increases as indicated in the amendments.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. These amendments which we are now considering are practically all technical amendments. They are small amendments. The large items of consideration were, of course, personnel, the officers, the Air Force, and the guard.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$2,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 31, line 15, after the word "Office", strike out the balance of line 15 and all of lines 16 to 23 inclusive, and the word "Congress" in line 24, and insert "Provided, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, not more than \$25,000,000 of the amounts received by the War Department during the fiscal year 1948 as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material shall be available for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: Provided further, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 32, line 8, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of \$5,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$2,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: On page 37, line 14, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of \$25,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the

Senate No. 24 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$15,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that these amendments we are discussing are actual reductions. The prior amendment reduced the amount from \$5,000,000 to \$2,000,000 and this amendment reduces the amount from \$25,000,000 to \$15,000,000.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate the committee. The thing that makes me boil is the fact that the Senate holds out for these great amounts. They have been known over in that end of the Capitol to increase the appropriation bills of the House, notwithstanding the fact that our Appropriation Committee does everything it can to hold them down.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania, after having been on this committee 11 years and considering a large number of appropriation bills, that there is much I would like to say along the line the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just spoken of but which the rules of the House forbid me saying.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive, be considered en bloc because they all pertain to the personnel ceiling.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 58, line 10, insert "with respect to War Department personnel."

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 58, line 11, strike out "Ordnance" and insert "War."

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 58, line 14, strike out "Department" and insert "Department or."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 58, line 15, after the word "agencies", insert "If such personnel is charged to a ceiling determination for another agency under 607 (g) (1) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended."

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 58, line 18, strike out "other civilian components" and insert "Organized Reserves."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 58, line 19, strike out "nor shall said section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, apply with respect."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider Senate amendments 37 to 92, inclusive, en bloc. These are the rescission amendments. The House rescinded in all \$1,100,000,000 in the 1942 to 1946 appropriations. The Senate increased this amount of rescissions by these amendments to \$1,438,956,500.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 58, line 2, strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 58, after line 2, insert:

"Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense, 1940-46, \$20,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 58, line 5, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 58, line 7, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,300,000."

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 58, after line 7, insert:

"Army War College: Army War College, 1942-46, \$2,500."

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 58, after line 7, insert:

"Adjutant General's Department: Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1942-46, \$7,000."

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 58, line 9, strike out "\$203,000,000" and insert "\$279,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 58, line 11, strike out "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$154,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 58, line 12, strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$121,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 58, line 13, after "\$3,000,000" insert "; and (4) claims of military and civilian personnel of the War Department, \$1,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 58, lines 15 and 16, strike out "\$160,000,000" and insert "\$190,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 58, line 18, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 58, lines 18 and 19, strike out "\$35,000,000" and insert "\$42,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 58, lines 19 and 20, strike out "\$55,000,000" and insert "\$59,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 58, line 20, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$27,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 58, line 21, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 58, line 22, strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 58, lines 24 and 25, strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert "\$165,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 59, lines 2 and 3, strike out "\$190,000,000" and insert "\$220,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 59, line 6, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000."

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 59, line 8, strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$120,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 59, line 10, strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$86,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 59, line 10, after "\$30,000,000" insert "(2) Military posts, \$13,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 59, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 59, line 11, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$21,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 59, line 14, strike out "\$362,000,000" and insert "\$363,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 59, line 17, strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$30,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 59, after line 17, insert:

"Special service schools: Special service schools, Army, 1942-46, \$2,000, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Infantry School, \$300; (2) Cavalry activities, \$200; (3) Field Artillery activities, \$750; and (4) Coast Artillery activities, \$750."

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 59, after line 17, insert:

"Armored force: Instruction in armored force activities, 1942-46, \$55,000."

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 59, line 19, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"United States Military Academy."

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"Pay of Military Academy, 1942-46, \$35,000."

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"Maintenance and operation, United States Military Academy, 1942-46, \$550,000."

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"National Guard: National Guard, 1942-46, \$3,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 59, line 21, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$28,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Inter-American relations, War Department: Inter-American relations, War Department, 1943-46, \$125,000."

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, War Department."

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Secretary of War, 1942-46, \$1,874."

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Staff, 1942-46, \$19,176."

Senate amendment No. 76: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Adjutant General's Office, 1942-46, \$29,321."

Senate amendment No. 77: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Cavalry, 1942-46, \$7,021."

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Inspector General, 1942-46, \$49."

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Judge Advocate General, 1942-46, \$3,342."

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Field Artillery, 1942-46, \$2,358."

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Chief of Finance, 1942-46, \$11,667."

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Infantry, 1942-46, \$7,508."

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Quartermaster General, 1942-46, \$20,176."

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 59, after line 21, insert:
"Salaries, Office of the Chief Signal Officer, 1942-46, \$4,987."

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Commanding General, Army Air Forces, 1942-46, \$1,877."

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Engineers, 1942-46, \$40,857."

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Ordnance, 1942-46, \$24,553."

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Chaplains, 1942-46, \$3."

Senate amendment No. 89: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, National Guard Bureau, 1942-46, \$3,615."

Senate amendment No. 90: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Coast Artillery, 1942-46, \$11,613."

Senate amendment No. 91: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Office of the Secretary: Contingent expenses, War Department, 1942-46, \$200,000."

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 59, line 22, strike out "\$1,100,000,000" and insert "\$1,438,966,500."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Blair Moody.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Illinois State Journal.

RELATING TO SAFETY IN BITUMINOUS COAL AND LIGNITE MINES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. J. Res. 130) relating to safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That whenever the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines or his duly authorized representative, shall, upon investigation or inspection of any coal mine, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177), find that the safety standards, set forth in the Federal Mine Safety Code for Bituminous Coal and Lignite Mines of the United States, adopted pursuant to an agreement dated May 29, 1946, between the Secretary of the Interior, acting as Coal Mines Administrator, and the United Mine Workers of America, as published in 11 Federal Register 9017 (title 32, CFR., pt. 304, secs. 304.1-304.15), with respect to ventilation, rock-dusting, storage and use of explosives, roof and rib support, the use of water or water with a wetting agent or other means of dust control where mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust, and prevention of fires in the underground workings of the

mines, are not being observed, he shall forthwith notify the owner and the operator of such mine and the State agency charged with the enforcement of safety measures in such mine of his findings and recommendations thereon, and request such owner, operator, and State agency severally to report to the Director of the Bureau of Mines the action taken with respect to said recommendations.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, shall, each 3 months, commencing September 1, 1947, report to the Congress of the United States with respect to the conditions of all bituminous coal and lignite mines investigated or inspected during the period, all recommendations and notices to the State agencies, and action taken by such mine owners, operators, and State agencies with respect to his findings and recommendations.

(b) The record of such inspections, findings, recommendations, notices, and reports, with respect thereto, shall be made available for public inspection as soon as practicable.

SEC. 3. (a) "Owner" includes a lessee and any person in possession or custody of a mine.

(b) "Operator" includes any agent, manager, superintendent, cooperative, or other person having control or supervision of a mine, directly or indirectly.

SEC. 4. This act shall remain in effect for a period of 1 year from the date this act is approved.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will establish a code for health and safety in the coal mines. Under the resolution, enforcement of safety measures is left to the State agencies which are given the benefit of findings and recommendations resulting from Federal investigations and inspections, as are the owners and operators of the mines. The owners, operators, and State agencies are to report back to the Director of the Bureau of Mines the action taken with respect to these findings. The Secretary of the Interior is in turn required to report to Congress every 3 months with respect to the conditions of all mines investigated and inspected during the period; all recommendations and notices to State agencies, and action taken by the mine owners, operators, and State agencies with respect to his findings and recommendations. These records are to be made available for public inspection as soon as practicable.

The Labor Committee is of the opinion that those portions of the safety code which dealt with operating conditions, which experience shows have been the most prolific causes of mining disasters, should be immediately subjected to the closest scrutiny of the United States Bureau of Mines. The committee felt that the adoption of safety standards with respect to ventilation, rock dusting, storage and use of explosives, roof and rib support, the use of water or other means of dust control where mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust, and prevention of fires, all within underground workings of mines, would go far toward effectively preventing further disasters such as occurred at Centralia, Ill.

At present the Bureau of Mines has 182 Federal mine inspectors. This legislation will need an additional 100 mine inspectors and 50 safety engineers.

Statistics from the Federal Bureau of Mines show that in the last 35 years

there have been 66,140 men killed, an average of 1,889 a year, in addition to 2,135 permanently disabled. If 80 percent of these 66,140 men were married and each left a widow and three children, there would be 211,649 widows and orphans and 2,135 incapacitated men living with families of 5—and the breadwinner totally disabled.

The resolution contains no additional enforcement or penalties but leaves such matters entirely within the province of the States. The act limits itself to remain in effect for 1 year from date it was approved. Thus, Congress places squarely upon the States the burden of making the mines safe and keeping them safe for the protection of men underground until Congress has had an opportunity to study the problem thoroughly, and makes it clear that if the States do not guard the safety of the miners, the Congress will act further.

If the States neglect to enforce the code for health and safety in the coal mines then it will be the duty of Congress to put more "teeth" in the Federal Mine Inspection Act. Coal mines operating in violation of safety regulations should be closed for the protection of the miners. We should give the Federal mine inspectors the power to close down unsafe mines until pronounced safe by Federal authority.

SAFETY IN THE MINES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the piping voice of opposition to mine safety is again drowned by the throaty roar of the explosion coming out of the Old Bend coal mine in West Frankfort, Ill., where yesterday 28 men were reported dead.

Last spring Bob Howe, national representative of UMW, and Bill German, representing coal operators, took several of us Congressmen down into the coal mines underground. I wish every Member of this House that has opposition to this coal mine safety bill would go underground and see the conditions under which coal miners work. Their objections to a strong safety code would quickly vanish if they would stand underground when the face of the coal is being blasted and the earth would shake under their feet.

Coal mining is basic to American industry. We must keep our mines running in good order. The demands of a destroyed Europe and a hungry world rely to a great extent on American coal. The heavy machinery introduced into American mines during the past years has greatly stepped up our production. It has also increased the hazards.

I am not satisfied with this bill because it does not go far enough. Any violations of a safety code should make it possible for the Government to close down unsafe mines. We cannot rely on all the States for proper enforcement. Some States have good mine laws and good enforcement, and some States have not. All American mines should be safe. While this bill does not go far enough, I shall nevertheless support it because it is a step in the right direction. It puts forth the Federal safety code as a norm for all mines to follow. Just let me give you an example of a few of the things involved. Some operators are

delinquent in keeping sufficient rock-dusting and wetting in the mines to remove the danger of explosion from coal dust. Rock-dusting, as you may know, neutralizes coal dust. Machines to disseminate the rock dust should always be in proper order and should spread the rock dust close to the face of the coal. Some operators do not have sufficient rock dust in the coal mines so that the coal dust becomes dangerous. And again, take the subject of ventilation. As coal is mined methane gas is released from the face. Proper ventilation of pure air should at all times be kept close to the face. Some operators do not close the break-throughs between the avenues in which the mining is carried on and consequently the fresh air is short-circuited. Again, old works in the mines must be properly sealed off. Another frequent violation is that operators do not have permissible machinery. Electrical sparks frequently fly from the electrical-control boxes of the machinery. These should be properly covered to prevent ignition of coal dust or methane gas. In other cases the roof is not properly shored up so as to prevent roof falls, a frequent cause of accidents. These and many more are feature dangers that must be guarded against by constant vigilance in the mines.

A strong safety code should be enforced throughout all the mines in the United States. Otherwise the young men will not come to work in the mines. They will go to other fields. The average age of a miner today is over 50 years. This indicates that young, prospective coal miners are becoming wary of entering the mines. It would be a tragedy if the American coal mines do not have proper safety enforcements. I plead with you, therefore, to pass this bill. We should pass any further legislation that is necessary to guarantee, so far as is humanly possible, the safety of human lives of men who mine the black gold.

There are no coal mines in my district, but I know that the industries in my district depend, like all other American industries, upon the soundness of the coal-mining industry. Let us, by the passage of this legislation, show that we are deeply concerned over the safety of the lives of these American citizens that go underground for their daily work.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon mine No. 8 of the Old Ben Coal Corp. was racked by an explosion. This mine is situated just beyond the city limits of West Frankfort, Ill., a large mining town in my district. Latest reports show that 28 men have died in this disaster. Sixteen bodies have been removed and 12 others are still in the gas-filled pits. More than 200 men were working at the time of the explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I am a coal miner. I think I know as well as any man in this Chamber what is happening in West Frankfort this morning and what were the thoughts of those who were trapped inside the fire yesterday, able to communicate with the outside world but with nothing to do but wait for death. Many of these men were my friends. I pledged myself when I came to Congress that I would do everything in my power to make coal mining a safer occupation.

Today we are to vote on Senate Joint Resolution 130, a mine safety measure offered by my good friend GERALD LANDIS. This resolution will make the inspection record of every mine available to the Congress and I, for one, will scrutinize closely the inspection record of every mine that blows up in the future.

I know, as does the honorable gentleman from Indiana, that, contrary to statements of selfish interests, you can have increased safety and full coal production at the same time. More than 50 percent of the accidents in coal mining are caused by falls of roof and rib. In the old hand-loading days of mining a man working by himself or with a buddy could hear the warning cracking and popping of the top coal in time to leave a dangerous place. With the modern system of mining the clank of machinery and rush of motors leave all this to chance.

The Congress of the United States cannot legislate against individual accidents, the results of carelessness or acts of God. But we can legislate against this killing of men by the hundreds in gas or dust explosions. Any coal miner knows that you cannot have a gas explosion if there is no gas present in the mine. Any coal miner knows that there is no necessity for the presence of gas if you have proper, regulated ventilation and a sufficient volume of air to dilute the gas and render it harmless. Any coal miner knows that there is no necessity for a coal-dust explosion if the coal dust is not allowed to accumulate in dangerous quantities. If you must have coal dust, it can be rendered harmless if diluted with rock dust in sufficient quantity.

The presence of gas or coal dust in dangerous quantity is not the result of individual carelessness or an act of God. It is the result of an unwillingness on the part of management to provide the proper means to remove these dangerous elements from the mine. In this highly competitive industry the man who is willing to do what is right and safe must be governed by what his competitor is willing to do or be placed at a disadvantage in the coal market. In too many cases employers are too willing to take a chance on safety so that they may undersell their competitor and make a few more dollars.

The day is not far away when the mining industry of this Nation is going to miss the efforts of the thousands of miners killed in our coal mines. The average age of the coal miner of today is over 50 years. As these older men are killed in mine accidents or die of their service-connected disabilities, who is going to move the coal of this Nation? Not the younger generation, for they are staying away from the pits in great numbers. Do you think the widows of these 28 men are going to allow their children to follow in their fathers' footsteps? They will not. Not even if you double the present rate of wages.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared now or any time to support legislation that will make the coal mines a safer place in which to work. To me these disasters are inexcusable. I am not worried about the cry of State's rights, or duplication of effort, or

double policing of the industry. I know our present efforts are not adequate, and if the Congress of the United States can pass one law that will stop this needless loss of life in part or in full, I am in favor of it. It is my sincere hope that, with increased safety as a goal, the next session of Congress will enact legislation which will for all time put an end to these tragic experiences prevalent in the coal-mining industry.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a communication, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JULY 25, 1947.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to inform you that on July 24, 1947, I transmitted to the Honorable Thomas J. Herbert, Governor of Ohio, my resignation as Representative in Congress of the United States from the Fourth District of Ohio effective at midnight September 2, 1947.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. JONES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, and that I may yield portions of that time if I so desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I contemplate the resignation of my very good friend, ROBERT F. JONES. When he came to Congress he was one of the youngest Members, and although he has been in Congress now nearly 8½ years he is still the youngest man in the Ohio delegation. I am sure the Ohio delegation, both Republicans and Democrats, wish him well in his new position. While his leaving will be a loss to the district which he has so ably represented and to the State of Ohio, it will be a much greater loss to the Nation. His outstanding work as a member of the Committee on Appropriations was distinctively Nation-wide in its scope. Anyone who saw him perform in his handling of the Interior Department Appropriation bill on this floor some few weeks ago surely realized that his work was distinctively Nation-wide. I have heard many Members say that by his masterful handling of that bill he proved that he is a master parliamentarian. His work on the Committee of Appropriations for the last few years has made him a national figure. And it has won for him the admiration of all the members of this great committee, whether Republicans or Democrats.

It is of his personal qualifications, though, that I comment with the most pleasure. He is a most wholesome and personable young man. I know of no young man who has developed faster, and

more deservedly, during my time in Congress. We all know that some men are more useful than others, but no one can long maintain a high place with his colleagues unless he has real merit. "Bob" JONES has many fine qualities of heart and mind that have earned for him the respect of all his colleagues. His keen mind and good judgment have established him as a man of great ability. His kind and courteous disposition has made for him many warm personal friends. His courage and honesty have won for him the respect of all who know him. When he leaves this House he will have the respect of all who know him. Those who know him best respect him most.

Here he is today with nearly 9 years of service in the greatest legislative body in the world behind him, yet he has before him the best years of his life. I predict for him great success in the position to which the President of the United States has appointed him. He was appointed because he had a good record which could not be successfully assailed.

He comes from a fine family. Today, his mother, his wife, and his fine children are in the gallery, and they are justly proud of him. Of him I can say, with the poet Owen Meredith:

In the midnoon of manhood, with plenty to do,
And every incentive for doing it, too.
With the duties of life just sufficiently pressing
For prayer, and of joys more than most men
for blessing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, my district, the Fifth District of Ohio, adjoins BOB JONES' district. The beautiful little city of Delphos is divided between the two districts right in the center of the town.

I came to Congress at the same time BOB JONES did. The affection I have for him is the affection I have for my own son. I can only say to you it is only gliding the lily to pay tribute to BOB JONES. He was a marked man in school, he was a marked man in college, and he was a marked man in the service of his county and the service of his State. Happy is the State and fortunate is the Nation that has a public servant such as ROBERT F. JONES.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. As a member of the Interior Department Appropriations Committee, may I say that the Democrats have the very highest regard and admiration for BOB JONES. He has made not only a competent but an honest chairman and member of that committee. I hate to see him leave Congress, and I concur in what the gentleman has said.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have watched wonderful men leave these halls, such as Lindsay Warren and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], as well as various other Members to serve in other branches of Government. The Nation never had a greater public servant than ROBERT JONES. The President has chosen wisely and well.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to subscribe to the fine things that have been said about BOB JONES' service in the House of Representatives. His has been an outstanding record and an inspiration to every Member of Congress. He has been a great public servant, and I predict further distinguished service for him in his new work.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Ohio, BOB JONES. I think without doubt he is one of the finest, clean-cut gentlemen that I have ever known in all my life. I have been associated with him here for several years and when I was on the Committee on Appropriations I did not know anyone who worked harder to try to do a good job. He is honest; he is honorable; he worked hard and is interested in doing what he thinks is best for his country. He succeeded here in the House. He succeeded back home. He will succeed as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I wish BOB JONES and his family Godspeed and I am sure that he will make a success and do a grand job for the United States in the job that the President has appointed him to. It is a great loss to the Congress of the United States for him to go from our midst.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without saying a word about the service of BOB JONES and the type and character of man I think he is.

I do not think there have been better men to serve in the House of Representatives than BOB JONES. I shall miss him very much personally, and I know that the House will miss his splendid ability and his great efficiency. He is going to a place where he can, and I think will, be of great service. He is going to a Commission which I think will not be hurt by the infusion of some BOB JONES blood.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure and a real privilege to have served in this body with BOB JONES, of Ohio. I consider him one of our outstanding Members—a man of unquestioned integrity and honesty. He has shown but one purpose, and that is to do the right as he sees the right in the interest of all the people of this great country.

As chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, he had a most difficult assignment. In his handling of that bill he showed a detailed knowledge of every single item in it. He always supported his arguments with facts.

The services of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will be missed. His appointment to the Federal Communications Commission by the President is a well-deserved recognition of BOB JONES'

ability. I predict that he will serve with distinction on that body, as he has served with distinction as a Member of Congress. He takes with him our affectionate regards and best wishes for his continued success.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, BOB JONES came here as an able young lawyer. As a result of the most diligent effort in committee and on the floor, and tremendous study, day and night, he became one of the ablest parliamentarians we had on the floor, and one of the most effective committee members and one of those who was best able to handle a bill and put it across on the floor.

I am sure that in the work he is tackling in the Federal Communications Commission he will make a record which will stand out just as his record has stood out here.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Bobbie knows that my family and I love him. There is really no need to elaborate on that statement. However I would like to offer a toast which Rip Van Winkle made popular in fiction years ago. It is one which has always appealed to me: "Here's to your health and your family's good health and may you all live long and prosper."

My family and I wish that for BOBBIE JONES and his family.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, as one who came here with BOB JONES as a freshman in 1939, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, I feel a pang that he is leaving the ranks of those of us who came here with the spirit of '76. But BOB JONES has made an especial mark for himself with his rugged integrity, his keen intellect, and his unflagging industry, his great courage. While we regret to see him leave here, I predict he will make a great mark in public service, in the important and arduous task that he takes up under this Presidential appointment. We all can bid him Godspeed and good luck.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have watched BOB JONES perform, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, at close range. I have seen him develop into one of the most effective chairmen I have ever seen perform on this floor. The way he handles his bills is absolutely superb. It is a fine thing that America can have such men as BOB JONES to serve in Congress. I know him, and I know his family, and I know what kind of an American he is and they are, and I wish him continued success in his new field of endeavor.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it would take a far better master of language to pay adequate tribute to BOB JONES than I. But if we were to enumerate all those

qualities that make a good legislator, BOB JONES has every one of them. I would not omit one. Hard work, intelligence, fairness, honesty, integrity, thoroughness, and so on down the line. In addition to that, he is a great guy and a great citizen. We wish him well in his new activity.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission will be the gainer and this House will be the loser when my good friend and long-time associate, ROBERT F. JONES of Ohio, leaves these halls to assume his new responsibilities as a member of the FCC.

My own emotions at this time are difficult to put into words. Never has there been an occasion in the history of these United States when the wisdom, the courage, the perseverance, the understanding, and the integrity of BOB JONES was more needed in Congress. Since he took his seat in the Seventy-sixth Congress, this country has fought and won a Second World War, our national debt has soared to astronomical figures. We are being called upon to feed, clothe, house, and administer medical aid to the whole world. We are faced with the necessity of combatting dictatorships in peace as we have faced totalitarianism in war. The vigorous thinking of the new Members of this House cries out for the leavening influence of experienced Members of longer service.

The gentleman from Ohio is a living example of the value of experience. He has ably served his constituents of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. His incisive mind has been of inestimable value in the deliberations of the subcommittee on State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary, in which capacity I have long been associated with him. His wide knowledge and his quick grasp of involved situations have made him one of the most efficient chairmen of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department who have ever acted to save the taxpayers' dollars. Not only has he served the people of his district and the people of his State, he has also served the people of every congressional district in every State in the Union. He has fought, without regard for his own health, that our Constitution might be preserved and that every American citizen might have more abundant life, free from the undue burden of governmental expenses.

Yes. I regret to see my old friend go. However, my regret is cushioned by the awareness that his chosen field of service is one of vital importance. I am confident that as a member of FCC Mr. JONES will have a signal opportunity to continue his statesmanlike career. Communications are the life lines of this Nation. It is indeed encouraging to know that the policies of the FCC will bear the imprint of Mr. JONES' courageous thinking for many years to come. No one of us who have had the truly great inspiration of working with him can gainsay the fact that the FCC is richer by a man who is a daily practitioner of Christian Americanism.

If the choice were ours, we would have you stay with us. But yours is the choice and you have chosen your post of duty. But when you go, the heartfelt good wishes and prayers of those who know your worth go with you, ROBERT JONES of Ohio—statesman, legislator, and patriot.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would not let this opportunity pass without adding my words of affection, admiration, and respect for our colleague, BOB JONES, who is going to leave us for a post on the Federal Communications Commission. There is not much new that can be added save to say that Congress is losing one of its most able Members, and in the well-chosen words of our minority leader, the Federal Communications Commission will receive a most valued member.

I, too, came to Congress along with BOB JONES, and during these 9 years that we have served together I have learned so well to know those sterling qualities of BOB JONES that have endeared him to all of us who have served here.

We wish him well and Godspeed in his new assignment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the legislative committee that has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the Federal Communications Commission I am somewhat familiar with the responsibilities that face a member of that commission. Having observed the diligence and the intelligence with which BOB JONES has pursued his career in the House of Representatives, I feel certain that he will add strength to that important independent commission of our Government.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as a Member from Ohio, I want to concur in every statement that has been made relative not only to my colleague but to my friend, BOB JONES.

You as Members of Congress will miss a fine Congressman. The district he has so ably represented in the past will miss a great Representative, and we of the Ohio delegation will certainly lose a fine colleague.

I am sure I speak the voice of his district, his friends, and I know of this Congress when I say to you: Bob, we wish you well and the best of luck.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, there was a group of almost a hundred new Members in the Seventy-sixth Congress, including the Honorable ROBERT JONES, of Lima, Ohio. I have observed my colleagues who came with me to the Seventy-sixth Congress from that time down to the end of this first session of the Eightieth Congress. I think no man in that group has performed better service, has developed into a better judge of governmental affairs and governmental problems or has thrown himself more

wholeheartedly into the problems of the Congress than has ROBERT JONES.

Power to him in his new environment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, while I am not a Methodist I wish to voice a profound "amen" to every word that has been said in these encomiums of BOB JONES. I never had the privilege of working in committee with him, but I want to add these words, that I know to be true from public and private contact with him here, and they have not been said as yet: We love him for the enemies he has made in the discharge of his duty. We love him for the sweetness of his disposition, for his million-dollar smile, and for the poise he has manifested on all occasions in this House. We love him. That is the summarizing of the whole tribute.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the closing hours of Congress prevent us from properly extolling the virtues of this great American from Ohio, BOB JONES. We have observed him as a great Member of the House. We confidently believe Bob will be one of the greatest additions to the Federal Communications in the history of that illustrious body.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the dean of the Ohio delegation quoted from Owen Meredith, who said—

At life's midnight
With plenty to do,
And plenty of incentive
For doing it too—

There was indeed an incentive for the appointment of BOB JONES. The citizenry of our Commonwealth have always said "We hear people, but who is sincere?"

BOB JONES is sincere.

As a county prosecutor he never was a fixer. As a Congressman he never tried to "just please." He was a man who always asked, "What is right?"—then he did it. He never asked "Who wants it?"

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, BOB JONES came to the Seventy-sixth Congress as a new Member at the same time I did. Since then he has been one of my closest and best friends. I liked and admired him from the first. Through the years that feeling has steadily grown. I have always respected his sincerity, his integrity, and particularly his ability. I have never seen or heard anyone handle an appropriation bill on the floor of the House of Representatives with more judgment, clarity, finesse, and ability than that exercised by ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio. His departure from our midst is a real loss to the Congress and the people. I am glad his services will be continued in

Government. BOB, here's wishing you happiness and success in your new career.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have also known BOB JONES since the Seventy-sixth Congress. It was my privilege to serve with him on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that handled the Department of Interior appropriation bill. I can vouch for all the fine things that have been said about BOB JONES.

While we are always happy to see our friends progress in life, we are reluctant to lose their association, and one of the happy thoughts I have in extending my congratulations to a Member who will not be in this House at the next session is the fact that he will remain in Washington, where he will continue his outstanding service to his country, and where we can have the benefit of his counsel, and the pleasure of his association.

The President's nomination of ROBERT F. JONES to the Federal Communications Commission and his subsequent confirmation by the Senate has met with spontaneous approval in and out of Congress, and I can well understand this, since having the privilege and pleasure of taking my seat in the Seventy-sixth Congress at the same time as my colleague, who was so wisely chosen by his constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Ohio.

From county prosecuting attorney in Ohio to five terms in Congress, and then elevation to the Federal Communications Commission by Presidential appointment and unanimous approval by the United States Senate is an outstanding accomplishment for a young man who has just passed his fortieth birthday. And I am certain that the record will show that this young man did not stop there—in the parlance of the day, he is destined to go places.

BOB JONES has the wisdom, judgment, aggressiveness, and will to get things done, and done in the right way. This I have intimately observed during my association with him on the Appropriations Committee, of which I had the privilege to become a member this year, and the good fortune to serve on the Interior subcommittee of which BOB was our capable, keen-minded, and hard-working chairman.

A real American, a capable and conscientious public servant, and a man among men, BOB JONES is the type of citizen of which our country can well feel proud. He is the representative type that has helped to make this country great, and whose services could not be used to better advantage than by having him continue in the service of our Federal Government.

Congratulations, BOB JONES. May the days ahead be filled with greater success than you have already earned, and which you so well deserve. You will always be in our thoughts, and I know I express the sentiments of every Member here when I say, come back and visit with us often.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks with reference to the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without paying respect to the accomplishments of ROBERT JONES, our colleague from Ohio. I wish to congratulate him upon being selected as a member of the important board of the Federal Communications Commission. BOB JONES has served faithfully in Congress. He is a man of courage, great ability, and splendid background. I am sorry that we must lose him in Congress but I know that he will serve the Nation well in his new capacity. I wish him good fortune and a long life of continued service to his country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to say a few words in commendation of BOB JONES. BOB and I entered the House together in 1939 and he has proven himself to be one of the most able Members of this body. May I join in seconding all of the good things which have been said here today about a very good man, who will make his mark in his new work on the Federal Communications Commission. If ever a man was worthy of such a position, ROBERT JONES of Ohio is that man.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, "That fellow, BOB JONES—I sure wish he was on our team!"

That statement came from Mr. Charles E. Cone, of Ephrata, Wash., and the official Columbia Basin Commission of the State of Washington. It came after the first passage through the House of the Interior Appropriations bill.

It was an outright compliment from one who believes in sound western development. It was a compliment from a man who did not agree with the cuts which had been made in the President's budget for western development in general and the Columbia Basin project in particular. It was a compliment to the legislative craftsmanship of the Honorable ROBERT JONES, of Ohio.

That we violently disagree with the achievements in cutting down on many items in the Interior Appropriations bill is primarily by reason of a difference of geographical viewpoint. We in the West, of course, have no objection to the outlay of Federal funds in the East for the purposes of flood control on torrential streams. We rejoice at the improvement of harbors and navigable waterways, even though in many instances these outlays are not repaid, excepting in the security they give to those whose industry results in tax payments.

Our western development will and, of course, should be repayable to the maximum amount and by the standard of eastern development, reimbursable twice, both in project funds and in the impetus to tax-paying industry which they will develop.

All of us admire a legislative craftsman and BOB JONES in his handling of the Interior Appropriations bill, even though we in the West do not agree, proved himself to be one of great ability.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] himself.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, of course I am very grateful for the kind words that have been said about me here this afternoon. I choose, however, to consider them as impersonal and that they represent an ideal to which you Members of the House, with whom I have served, would like to see a colleague of yours adhere. I deeply appreciate the confidence of the people of the Fourth District of Ohio who have elected and reelected me to serve them for nearly a decade as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is nearly the last bulwark of liberty and the last deliberative body in the world. We must not forget, and I know the Members here are always conscious of the fact, that we still are free men and that so long as freemen exist there is always a strong and great legislative body.

I go to the position to which I have been appointed by the President of the United States with a background of the traditions of this House of Representatives. I go as a recent Member of a great legislative body, close to the people; a legislative body that cherishes and defends freedom. We may differ at times over the way we arrive at the solution of our problem, but we discuss them, we debate, decide and when the majority speaks, we all abide by that decision. That is what distinguishes us from nearly every country in the world. Today the world is on fire and police governments are the rule rather than the exception.

The nearly 10 years I have spent here I know will assist me greatly in the duties I shall take up on September 3. To have the point of view of men and women who are trying to preserve liberty and freedom is a distinguished background and will be of great assistance in serving on the Federal Communications Commission which has so much to do with freedom of speech and freedom of communications throughout the United States, in fact throughout the world.

Again I thank you, I thank you sincerely. I appreciate immensely the many fine kindnesses you have shown me in the 8½ years I have served as a Member of this body. It has been my privilege in that time to serve under the greatest Speakers that the House of Representatives has ever had. It has been my pleasure to serve with men and women of sterling character. I am grateful, indeed, to have been a Member of this, the last great outpost of liberty in the world.

I shall miss you all, of course. Our relationship may never be the same again because, after all, I am leaving the House of Representatives to become a "bureaucrat." I do not expect any quarter from any one in this House in that capacity, because I gave no quarter as a member of the Appropriations Committee to any

of the bureaucrats. I hope sincerely, though, that when I do come back you can give to me the same clean bill of health you have given me as I leave you today.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ROBERT F. JONES AND HON. LEO F. RAYFIEL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, offer full praise to BOB JONES and say to him, "Hail and farewell."

There is another Member of our body who is marked out for distinction, and that is my distinguished friend, our gallant colleague from Brooklyn, N. Y., LEO RAYFIEL, who has been designated as United States judge for the eastern district of New York. His appointment has recently been confirmed by the Senate. Leo, I am sure, will make a good judge, because he was always a good lawyer and a good Congressman. Good Congressmen make good judges. They make the laws, and thereby have the greatest equipment to interpret the laws. I would say about Leo that we love him for the many friends that he has made. He is a benign sort of fellow, generous, fair-minded, studious, of considerable erudition and modesty. I am sure that when he is a judge he will put human rights above property rights. I am sure that he is going to be fair and just to litigants and tolerant to the lawyers. Some judges are very intolerant. The story I will tell you could not be made applicable to Judge RAYFIEL. One of the present members of the Supreme Court was hearing a case argued, and the present Secretary of War, General Royall, was the attorney for the defense, and one of the judges was particularly intolerant and he kept closely questioning General Royall. General Royall tried his best to answer, but it was only with the greatest difficulty that he could answer all those vexatious and unnecessary questions that this judge directed to him, until finally asked another question, the general said, "If I, Judge, would answer that question, it would indeed be like the blind leading the blind." I am sure Judge RAYFIEL will be courteous and considerate and fair and most tolerant to litigants while a judge. He has marked out a splendid career in the House. He will hew out an even more glorious career as a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

DECLARATION OF RECESS DURING REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the week the Speaker may declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONFERRING OF MEMBERSHIP ON SPEAKER MARTIN IN AMVETS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to a meeting that is to be held in the Committee on Ways and Means room in the Old House Office Building this evening at 8 o'clock, at which time our honorable and distinguished Speaker the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will be given an honorary membership in the new House of Representatives Post, No. 19, of AMVETS. All Members are cordially invited to attend the meeting. The principal speaker of the evening will be the distinguished minority leader, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. I hope that all the Members will take notice of this and come out and do proper honor to our distinguished Speaker.

The AMVETS have been given a charter by the Eightieth Congress. It is one of the fine, vigorous, and patriotic veterans organizations of World War II. Mr. MARTIN's honorary membership will add dignity to the ranks of the American Veterans of World War II, whose ranks now contain many distinguished citizens throughout the Nation. The AMVETS are doing a fine job in all posts of the Nation for veterans of World War II. The future of this organization gives every promise of becoming one of the great and beneficial veteran's organizations which will inspire and keep alive our love and patriotic zeal for the United States of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "employees," the following: "who shall be entitled to accumulate annual leave to the maximum of 90 work days exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from the continental United States and such time as may be necessarily occupied in awaiting sailing or flight."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 101 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "Commonwealth of the Philippines" the following: "(or the Republic of the Philippines)".

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 106 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 106. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of \$400,000,000 for the purpose of

paying compensation to the extent authorized in this title and of such sum, not to exceed \$8,400,000 shall be available to pay the expenses of the Commission. All moneys heretofore or hereinafter appropriated under authority of this title shall remain available until April 30, 1951."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. The bill that has just been read is not the same number as the bill containing these provisions that was objected to last Monday on the Consent Calendar. Is it in order to consider a Senate bill under these conditions?

The SPEAKER. Under suspension of the rules either a House or a Senate bill may be considered.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any need to take much time on this bill inasmuch as it was explained last Monday when the Consent Calendar was called. Only one person objected to it then, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and he will explain his reasons shortly.

The bill, as originally introduced and passed by the Senate, consisted of three amendments to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1947, which we passed last year. First, it allows employees of the War Damage Commission who go to the Philippines to carry on during the next 4 years the work of examining and settling claims to accumulate up to 90 days annual leave, which merely gives the same privilege which Government employees in this country ordinarily enjoy.

The second amendment recognizes the fact that the Commonwealth of the Philippines, which existed when this act was passed, is now the Republic of the Philippines, and the language of the law is changed accordingly.

The third amendment is the one about which there is some disagreement. In the Rehabilitation Act authorizing \$400,000,000 to be used in payment of legitimate war-damage claims in the Philippines, 1 percent or \$4,000,000 was provided for the administrative expenses of the Commission. At that time the question was raised in the Committee on Insular Affairs, where the bill was handled, as to whether that would be enough. They asked for \$4,000,000 because that seemed like a great deal of money so we let it go at that. Now they come back and present the load of work that is before them, and it is obvious that they cannot, with that amount of money, examine with adequate care all the million-and-a-quarter claims that it appears will come in. They have 4 years in which to examine more than a million claims. That is at the rate of 250,000 claims a year, which means that almost 1,000 claims have to be settled each work day. This requires, on the estimate basis of one person handling two claims a day,

500 employees just to adjudicate the claims, to say nothing of secretarial and other help.

The question is, Do we want to increase from 1 to 2.1 the percentage of the \$400,000,000 to be authorized for the Commission's administrative expenses so that it can carefully examine these claims and eliminate fraudulent or unworthy claims; or do we want just to send these men out with \$400,000,000 and a check-book to pass out the American taxpayers' money without proper protection?

We all know the zeal and diligence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his efforts to economize. I myself think that in this case he is following a policy which is the opposite of economy, because this bill does not in the least increase the total amount of money appropriated. It only decides whether the Commission is to have a large enough share for administrative expenses so that it can reasonably be expected to spend it wisely, instead of wasting much of it. If it does not have enough money to build up an adequate staff, it simply cannot spend it wisely.

This bill comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with unanimous approval. It was given to the Committee on Foreign Affairs only because the Committee on Insular Affairs, where this legislation was originally developed, no longer exists.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for yielding to me. I merely wish to say something about the membership of the Commission under discussion. Mr. Frank Waring, Chairman of the Commission is a man of great ability. He has the respect and confidence of many Members of this House. He has appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations and I wish to state that he made a fine impression on the membership of the committee with his testimony regarding Philippine needs and requirements. Members of the committee believe Chairman Waring is a man of exceptional ability and that in the administration of these funds he is not forgetting the interests of the American taxpayer. Another member of the Commission is well-known to the membership of this House. He is the Honorable Francisco Delgado, who represented the Philippine Commonwealth Government in this body. He was then the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines. Mr. Delgado and his beautiful and capable wife will not be forgotten by scores of Members because of their delightful personalities and their daily efforts to bind stronger the friendships between the peoples of the Philippine Islands and those of the United States of America. Mr. Delgado recently completed a long journey throughout the northern provinces of the Philippine Islands. He was kind enough to send me a copy of the report which he made following this journey. The report indicates a most careful investigation of damage and claims. I have not heard the testimony

on this particular bill but I felt Members should know something about at least two members of the commission with whom so many of you are acquainted. I have confidence in Chairman Waring and feel that he will continue making unbiased reports on his administration to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman two or three questions? The \$400,000,000 is an obligation of the United States, is it not?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. The Congress assumed it last year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no reasonable discussion that can be raised on that matter at all. Is there any reason for us to assume that the Filipinos will get back on their feet industrially and otherwise until they have a substantial amount of these claims paid, with their homes destroyed and their industries thrown out of balance in every way that can be imagined and with their principal cities destroyed? It is a very difficult problem. I have been through the islands since the war and I have seen the damage there. I know something about Philippine industry as I have studied it closely for many years.

It seems to me the best way we can possibly save money to the American taxpayers is to let these claims be administered expeditiously and in a businesslike manner. I know that we could not take a group to the Philippines and handle this \$400,000,000 bill on the basis of 1 or 2 percent of the total amount. There is no insurance company that could handle it on that basis. I think the gentleman's committee is very wise in providing for this additional use of funds for administration, so that these claims can be settled and this work expedited and the Filipino people gotten back on their feet so that they can produce for themselves. I am very much in favor of the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I should have stated earlier that this bill was originally introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] who was formerly chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the present chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

We have the Senate bill before us today instead of their bills only because it is more convenient, the Senate having already passed the bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. May I ask if these claims are the claims of people other than citizens of the United States or people from the United States who had investments there and the Filipinos themselves or do these claims include any of the Japanese nationals?

Mr. JUDD. Citizens of the United States as well as of the Philippines can put in claims if they use the money for rebuilding or reopening the business or home or mine or factory which was damaged. Japanese nationals are not

more to adjudicate these claims than would ordinarily be the case is because each claim has to be examined to determine whether the person who puts in the claim is an American or Philippine citizen or of certain other categories; second, whether he was a collaborator with the Japanese during the occupation; third, whether he was the actual owner of the property because the homes and papers of thousands were destroyed, the courthouses were destroyed including deeds and public records. Then the proper value of the property has to be determined. This commission cannot operate like an insurance company which pays on the basis of the face value of a policy where there is no question as to ownership or value, and so forth. Furthermore the property to be appraised may be in any one of 10,000 islands. So the task is enormous.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Is it assumed that the liabilities are all those of the United States—are all just claims that can be established to be paid?

Mr. JUDD. No. If the total of all claims determined valid exceeds the \$400,000,000 authorized, the payments will be reduced proportionately. It is provided further that if any reparations or indemnity in money or bullion is recovered from the Japanese, it shall be applied to this fund. If \$100,000,000 should come back, our obligation would be reduced correspondingly.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I think that Members who are not members of the committee are entitled to that information.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly. I shall be glad to answer any other questions.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wanted to corroborate the gentleman's statement to the effect that when the committee considered this bill last year the question of the percentage allowance for administration of the act was considered, and all of us thought that the percentage set in the bill was insufficient. However, those who were supporting the measure felt that they could get along with that amount of money. Naturally, we did not give them more than they asked for. However, we all recognized, or at least we all doubted their ability to get along with that small percentage. I simply wanted to verify what the gentleman said.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], who is one of the authors of the resolution.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very familiar with this bill from its inception. It arose in the Insular Affairs Committee last year, of which committee I was chairman at that time. At the time the bill was passed a number of the members of the committee who had had some observation of insurance companies in settling claims felt that 1 percent was entirely too small to make any businesslike or economical handling of these

claims. To begin with, the islands are 10,000 miles away, and a great many people are going to have to be transported to the Philippines to do the job of properly examining and settling these claims. When you get down there, there are 10,000 of those islands. There will have to be a great deal of traveling back and forth, because you cannot intelligently settle a small claim except on the ground where the claim arose. Here is a man who claims his shack was burned. You have to find out whether it was actually burned and whether he actually owned it or not. Here is a man who has a carabao that was destroyed by the Japanese. You have to find out whether he actually owned a carabao. Unless you have adequate personnel to go down there and handle these things in the proper way it will cost this country perhaps one to two hundred million dollars in losses by maladministration. I think if we deny the Commission enough funds to adequately provide for personnel to go down there and intelligently handle this job it will be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

This bill does not require the appropriation of any more money. This money for administrative purposes will be taken out of the \$400,000,000 which the Congress has already provided. It is just a question as to whether or not we handle it in a businesslike way, send intelligent people down there to go into these claims, and deny those that are groundless and deny those that are excessive and pay those that are just. Quite a number of you gentlemen have had some experience in handling the liquidation of claims for insurance companies and liability companies. You have represented liability companies as lawyers. If you have, you know there is not a liability company in America, with all their skill, who can begin to settle claims right here on the ground for 1 percent. It takes 6 or 8 percent for the average liability company. You gentlemen who have had experience along that line well know that.

So the passage of this bill means that this \$400,000,000 that the taxpayers of America are digging up to settle these claims and bring about the rehabilitation of the Philippines simply means whether you are going to go into it in a businesslike way and allow the personnel in charge to have enough money to go into the matter, or whether you just put somebody on a stump out there and distribute the money without any rhyme or reason.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, certain committee amendments were added to this bill largely through the commendable efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. These amendments, as I am sure he will explain, provided essentially the same restrictions with respect to loyalty of American personnel on the Commission and screening by the FBI as we have put into other legislation. Also provisions for preventing, if possible, use of Filipino personnel or payments to persons who are Communists.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me a little time?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our committee has taken up a recommendation for legislation that was sent to the Speaker and referred by him to our committee, to assist persons in the Philippine Islands. I am wondering just how that would affect legislation that is before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry; I do not know just what the gentlewoman refers to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have had very many requests for appropriations but I am not going to be against this bill—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are two or three propositions dealing with the people in the Philippines. This bill deals only with war damage which we propose to pay. It goes back to the very inception of the fact that the Philippine Government was a part of this country, you might say, when the war broke out. We had not given them their independence. We went in there and drove the Japs out and did a lot of destruction ourselves with our own guns, our own bombs. This is a liability of the United States.

In addition to that the Philippine Republic is certainly going to need an enormous amount of assistance from the United States if it is to stand on its own feet as a republic. We know that. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will find and that her committee will find that the \$400,000,000 of war damage does in no way clean up the Philippine bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I cannot yield further.

I wish to state that I would like very much to send a group of members from my committee to study the whole Philippine question out there insofar as compensation for the disabled is concerned; but I was told it was late to bring up anything of that sort. It seems to me this is a foreign-affairs Congress. I say it is not fair to send so much to foreign countries that we have nothing left for our own. Anyway, we have spent so much in foreign countries and will spend much more, and our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has not as yet been able to secure any more money in order to send the members of our committee through the country inspecting the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Veterans' Administration regional offices and branch offices for which inspection there is such great need. Millions and millions of dollars have been sent to foreign countries. It is time we took care of our disabled. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is really a foreign-affairs Congress. During the war our soldiers came first; in peace foreign countries come first and other nondisabled in the United States. It is not just, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the Eightieth Congress draws to a close, many questions have been asked regarding enactment of further legislation of direct benefit to the war veterans.

While I cannot at this time say definitely as to what further legislation may be acted upon during this first session and what may be acted upon when we reconvene for the second session in January, I would like to point out a few pertinent facts.

Last January 6, President Truman in his message to the Congress on the State of the Union, referred to additional veterans' legislation as follows:

Exclusive of mustering-out payments and terminal-leave pay, the program for veterans of all wars is costing over \$7,000,000,000 a year—one-fifth of our total Federal budget. This is the most far-reaching and complete veterans' program ever conceived by any nation.

Except for minor adjustments, I believe that our program of benefits for veterans is now complete. In the long run, the success of the program will not be measured by the number of veterans obtaining financial aid or by the number of dollars we spend. History will judge us not by the money we spend, but by the further contribution we enable our veterans to make to their country. In considering any additional legislation, that must be our criterion.

That statement can leave no question about the opposition of President Truman to additional veterans' legislation of any consequence.

Further than this the House of Representatives' Committee on Veterans' Legislation has had reports from Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Director of the Veterans' Administration, against scores of the measures now pending in the House of Representatives.

In addition, he reports that the bills cannot be considered to be in accord with the program of the President's Budget Bureau. That simply means that the President is against these bills.

For example, on July 18, General Bradley wrote to the committee regarding H. R. 3584, a bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

General Bradley furnished the committee a report on the estimated cost of such legislation under date of June 3, 1947. In his letter of July 18, 1947, General Bradley said:

The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, that there is no objection to the presentation of such report to the committee and that this bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

In view of this expressed opposition of the President, it certainly would be fair to assume that he would likely veto any such bill that the Congress might send to him.

However, notwithstanding the opposition of President Truman to the enactment of additional veterans' legislation, as expressed in his message on the State of the Union, the House of Representatives and the Congress have passed many meritorious acts for the benefit of war veterans.

I call attention to the following favorable actions of the House of Representatives and the Congress:

From Veterans' Affairs Committee:

H. R. 3961, increasing the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American and Civil War Veterans. Passed House June 30, 1947. Passed Senate July 19, 1947.

H. R. 3889, establishing the presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 1353, Public Law 5, to repeal time limit for reinstatement of national service life insurance.

H. R. 1327, Public Law 34, to provide for renewal for a fifth 5-year period, 5-year level premium term insurance plan for World War I veterans.

House Joint Resolution 196, Senate Joint Resolution 115, Public Law 91, providing for the continuation of offices of Veterans' Administration in the Philippines.

H. R. 2368, Public Law 115, increasing the revolving fund from \$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000 for the purpose of making loans to veterans of World War II undertaking vocational training.

House Concurrent Resolution 54, provide for use of Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa. Passed House July 23, 1947.

H. R. 2181, amending veterans regulations pertaining to institutional on-farm training for veterans. Passed House May 12, 1947.

H. R. 3739, providing for Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va. Passed House July 17, 1947. Passed Senate July 23, 1947.

From Judiciary Committee:

H. R. 1888, Public Law 216, to incorporate AMVETS. Passed House April 9, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

H. R. 3398, Public Law 126, extending time for bringing alien fiancées to the United States.

H. R. 3149, Public Law 213, expedite admission to United States of alien spouses and minor children of veterans. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

Numerous private bills authorizing admission to the United States of veterans' alien wives barred by existing law.

From Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 1426, extending veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of ex-servicemen. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 739, providing for protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reduction of forces in Federal service. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 966, to amend section 14 Veterans' Preference Act. Passed House June 19, 1947.

H. R. 1389, to amend section 2 Veterans' Preference Act. Passed House June 19, 1947.

S. 1180, issuance of Gold Star Mother commemorative stamps. Passed House July 21, 1947.

From Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1380, veteran death gratuities. Passed House June 16, 1947.

H. R. 3394, to provide for return of World War II dead. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate, amended, July 23, 1947.

H. R. 1544, providing Gold Star lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of veterans who lost their lives. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 4017, cashing of terminal-leave bonds. Passed House July 7, 1947. Passed Senate July 19, 1947.

H. R. 2314, expedites lump-sum payments under Naval Aviation Cadet Act to survivors of deceased officers. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

From Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 4059, providing for homesteading in Alaska for veterans. Passed House July 21, 1947.

From Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 2780—S. 854, Public Law 85, emergency veterans' housing—\$35,500,000 authorization.

H. R. 3203, Public Law 129, provides among other things priorities for veterans and families in connection with housing material.

H. R. 3492, war housing disposal—permanent buildings—provides for veteran priority and financing of purchase under National Housing Act. Passed House June 18, 1947.

H. R. 3448, amends Federal Home Loan Bank Act to permit banks to accept 25-year mortgages, which is the maturity period of many veteran home loans. Passed House June 2, 1947. Passed Senate July 23, 1947.

From the Appropriations Committee:

H. R. 4031, Public Law 161, providing for expenditures after July 1, 1947, for amputees.

From Ways and Means Committee:

H. R. 479, provides for refund of income taxes paid for year in which serviceman died while in service. Passed House July 22, 1947.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman read from the President's message, then he began reading a list of great acts this Congress had passed in the interest of the veterans. May I ask the gentleman if the President has vetoed any of those bills?

Mr. HALLECK. No; he has not.

Mr. RAYBURN. In all probability if the House under its present leadership would follow the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and pass some more good laws with reference to the veterans, in all probability the President would not veto those?

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the minority leader, as I have said in my

statement, the opposition of the President is expressed through the Bureau of the Budget, and it has been expressed to most of these measures. Now, then, in connection with the cashing of the terminal-leave-pay bonds, as I pointed out in the debate on that measure, the officials from the Treasury Department testified and appeared in opposition. That measure is now at the White House. I could not undertake to say whether the President will veto that measure or not.

Mr. RAYBURN. The thing about it is that the representatives of the Treasury and the administration in all probability appeared before the committee in opposition to some form of payment, but did they appear in opposition to the bill as it passed the House? Does the gentleman's memory go back and can he say definitely that that is the fact?

Mr. HALLECK. I can say with all reasonable assurance that that is the fact. With respect to the cashing of the terminal-leave bonds there was at one time a substitute proposal suggested which would have simply made them negotiable. My information is that the Treasury appeared against the cashing of the bonds, which was the manner in which the legislation was finally passed.

Mr. RAYBURN. It goes without saying, however, that the President has not vetoed any of these measures that the gentleman says this Congress has passed in the interest of the veteran.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentlewoman. The time is entirely in the hands of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not have the time right now; I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath].

REENACT PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed gratified to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] call attention to legislation in the interest of the veterans, all of which was recommended and urged and advocated by the President and nearly unanimously voted by the Democratic Members.

But, unfortunately, such was not the case as to the high cost of living which the President repeatedly has urged be reduced. About that you gentlemen have absolutely failed to do anything. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution today, fully appreciating, I want you to know, that no action will be taken in these closing days of the session, but I am introducing it for the purpose and in the hope that those responsible for the high cost of living may finally yield to the appeals of the President and do something to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, and at the same time to give

you gentlemen a chance and an opportunity, when you go home, to explain to the people why no action has been taken to reduce the high cost of living, when that action lies in your power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the text of the resolution I am now introducing and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Resolution to reestablish effective price and rent control

Whereas notwithstanding the assurances given last year by industrial leaders, manufacturers and building contractors that if price controls were removed and if they were free of what they then termed "unnecessary controls and restrictions affecting free enterprise" that the then-existing high prices would not only be held in check but would be gradually lowered and home construction would increase; and

Whereas since the Office of Price Administration was abolished the prices of all foods and commodities have continuously risen during the past year and the cost of living today is at the highest point in history in the United States; and

Whereas with the end of rent control the cost of living will rise more sharply; and

Whereas despite the report of the Mid-year Economic Report of the President, and the appeal of President Truman to manufacturers, businessmen, and builders to reduce prices, prices have continued to rise; and

Whereas people of low and even medium incomes are obliged to deny themselves of actual necessities of life and are deprived of proper housing accommodations; and

Whereas many economists fear that the continuous increase in prices is certain to create inflation and will eventually force employees to demand higher wages to the endangerment of the peaceful conditions now existing between industry and labor; and

Whereas the stoppage of the dangerous increase in the cost of living can only be accomplished by reestablishing price and rent control: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby vested with all the powers which were conferred on the Price Administrator by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as such act was approved on January 30, 1942. Such powers shall be subject to the same limitations and safeguards as were contained in such act as it was approved on such date, with the exception that the powers vested in the President by this act shall terminate on December 31, 1948.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to establish in the executive branch of the Government such an agency or such agencies as he deems necessary to accomplish the objective of effective price and rent control and home construction. The President is further authorized to delegate to any such agency or agencies or to any other department or agency any or all of the powers vested in him by the first section of this act.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, these avacious business and industrial czars who are plunging this country toward uncontrolled inflation and risking the soundness of our economy have proved that they have no intention of heeding the President's plea for reducing prices.

COST OF LIVING INDEX STANDS AT 190 PERCENT

On the other hand, prices continue to go up, and this morning the cost of living

index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics stands above 190 percent of the 1935-39 average.

This means that the cost of living has doubled in less than 8 years.

Most of that increase has occurred since OPA was murdered on the floor of this House 13 months ago.

Price control was repealed in the face of my warnings.

It was repealed in the face of the President's warnings and of his veto message on the first bill presented him.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the only thing we can do is to reinstate price control.

It is too late to keep prices from rising; but it is not too late to keep them from going higher.

There is still time to prevent the absolute prostration of such an inflation panic as has created chaos and anarchy in China.

There is still time to save private enterprise from its own folly and suicide.

These big industries, the cartels, and the monopolies and the trust and combines, with their enormous and smooth-running lobbies, are continuing to roll up huge profits, enormous reserves, and surpluses, and they are sitting on top of the world.

But the world is made up of consumers, and the weight of those unconscionable profiteers is crushing the people.

ONE 1939 DOLLAR BUYS TWO 1947 DOLLARS

It takes two 1947 dollars to buy what one 1939 dollar bought.

At the rate we are going it will not be long before it will take three 1947 dollars to buy what \$1 would get in 1939.

Now is the time to prevent that wild and uncontrolled inflation which is bound to result if the inflationary panic ever gets started.

Now is the time to put on the brakes. Now is the time to reenact the price-control laws.

So, as I stated, I have today filed a joint resolution which empowers the President to exercise any or all of the powers we gave to President Roosevelt in 1942 under the Price Control Act. We have faith and trust in President Truman, and we know that he will use those powers with great discretion.

I know that many of you here on this floor are serving your first term. You do not and cannot remember the recurrent debates on wartime controls.

But I know, too, that all of you can remember what took place when the President declared the existence of a state of emergency and the Nazi war machine began to be heard clear across the ocean.

HOW INFLATION BEGINS

War plants went to work on defense orders. The Army and Navy were enlarged. Everybody was at work, and money was flowing freely. People with money naturally want to spend it, and pretty soon we were beginning to see real shortages in the stores. Then other controls were imposed, and we converted to all-out war. People could spend their money only for food and clothing.

We had to have price controls and rationing to make sure that everybody got

his just share. Even so, you remember that timid housewives filled their closets with sugar and canned goods and soap.

The same thing can happen in peace.

Once the panic of fear gets started, it is too late to stop it. When people begin to take their money out of the banks and to demand silver instead of paper, when they begin to buy diamonds instead of bonds, or to hide the money in the mattress, and when they begin to buy huge stocks of all scarce items—canned goods, sugar, and other things that will keep—you know the palsy of fear is settling over the land.

We dare not wait, Mr. Speaker.

Now is the time to act.

We cannot depend on "private enterprise."

THE LITTLE MAN IS SQUEEZED

I am not criticizing legitimate business. I have been in business all my life. I like to make a profit as well as you or anybody else.

But today the big interests are not making a legitimate and reasonable profit. They are making exorbitant profits, and the little man is being squeezed.

The people who are being hurt by these soaring prices are the workers, the housewives, the farmers, the small-salaried white-collar workers, the annuitants and insurance beneficiaries with small fixed income, the small retailers, the patriotic people who bought Government bonds and held onto them, the taxpayers.

The big boys are getting theirs. As the GI's used to say, they never had it so good.

But while they are getting theirs on a constantly rising market, they are hurting the best interests of our country. They are sacrificing our future economic security and stability to immediate and inordinate profits.

More than once, when I have observed the big companies flouting the law and getting black-market prices for lumber and meat and building materials through side payments and tie-in sales and other such devices for evading the law, if not breaking it, I have urged the Department of Justice to proceed against them under the antitrust laws or any other applicable statutes, and I am glad to say that it was possible to break up some of those profiteering rackets, but unfortunately not very many.

ACTION IS NECESSARY

I also demanded action against the packers who have so brazenly defied the Nation, and who went on strike to keep the country meatless until price ceilings were removed. Over a year ago I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the American Meat Institute and of the packing industry. Repeatedly I brought to the attention of the House proof that the packers' warehouses were bulging with meat and meat products, and that their own feeding pens, in close proximity to their slaughterhouses, were filled with beef stock and hogs.

When the ceilings were removed this meat flowed onto the retail market in a high-priced stampede at double the cost to the consumer.

Everything jumped in price—vegetables, canned goods, shortening, fresh fruit, bread.

They are still going up. We dare not wait any longer.

The President's appeals have been ignored by big business, as have the warnings of the President's economic advisers and of many of the outstanding economists of private industry.

As I told you, I have no hope of action on this resolution prior to adjournment. I do have hope that it will make our businessmen pause and think and give heed to the President's repeated requests and warnings. If they do not, then at the special session if one is called, or in the early days of the next session, I shall demand action—and what is more important to you on the left, the people will demand action.

Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor yesterday, and at the same time ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the other day we took care of the Japanese who were interned by us on the west coast by authorizing the Attorney General to entertain suits for damages in the amount of \$2,500. We are now entertaining the claims of the Filipinos pursuant to the \$400,000,000 which we advanced to them. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce several weeks ago reported out the bill H. R. 4044, which will do the thing we are really interested in, namely, taking care of our own people who were internees in Santo Tomas and elsewhere, and making provision for those who suffered the Death March of Bataan. I hope and trust that before this session ends, after we have taken care of everybody else in the world, we will stand up and take care of our own people when that bill is brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, you have before you this afternoon a bill which is designed to do more than the bill you passed a year ago to help take care of the Filipinos. You have given the Filipinos \$400,000,000 to take care of the things that happened over there during the war, and to pay for the damages that were suffered. As was said a moment ago, if an American had his house destroyed in the last war, unless he had war-damage insurance he would have gotten nothing for it, but you are going over to the Philippines and offer to settle all the claims there, and pay everybody, as nearly as you can, out of the amount we have authorized to be appropriated, \$400,000,000.

This bill comes from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee has recommended that we pay to foreign countries millions and millions and millions of dollars. You are not through.

That committee is going to bring in many more bills asking you to pay hundreds of millions and hundreds of millions more to foreign countries. Where are you going to get the money? I have asked that thousands of times in this House, and you have not been able to answer.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the bill I referred to a moment ago, H. R. 4044, we cover into the Treasury of the United States \$250,000,000 to \$275,000,000 of German and Japanese vested assets in the United States.

Mr. RICH. We ought to get that money. That is the only thing we are going to get from Germany for fighting the last war. We are not after anything; we would just like a little justice. I should like to have a little justice for the American people. You have passed this bill for \$400,000,000. Last year you gave the War Damage Commission \$4,000,000 to go over there and settle these claims. If anybody here thinks \$4,000,000 is not a lot of money, then I do not know anything about finance. I think \$4,000,000 is a lot of money in any man's language, especially the language of the United States of America, but the way we have been talking in the last 5 or 6 years it is only a pea in a pod.

Before they get started they come in here and want to boost this sum to \$8,400,000. They have not even got started. The bureaucrats, the rascals, have been asking us for money for the last 6 or 8 or 10 years and you have been giving it to them like drunken sailors. You have been passing out money as if it did not mean anything. Remember that the taxpayers of this country have to pay the bill. They want \$4,000,000 to go over there and start these claims. The claims will not be in here for 2 or 3 months. Then if they go over there and try to aggregate the claims for the different amounts, that will take them 3 or 4 months. Why not wait until next year before you pass this legislation, and see just the number of claims you are going to have and how difficult it will be to adjudicate the claims. You can do it more intelligently. You can do it more wisely and you can do it to the best advantage of the taxpayers of America, and you will not be asked by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to increase the amount from \$400,000,000 to about a billion dollars or \$1,500,000,000. If you want more time I think you can get a little more time to do it after you have spent 5 years on it, and you can do it in a wise and judicious manner.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. DORN. Would not the gentleman be more correct if, in speaking of money being sent to Europe, he said billions of dollars instead of millions of dollars?

Mr. RICH. Well, I want to talk in a language that I think most of the Members of Congress understand. They have been talking in the billions so long that I am not very sure whether they know what they are talking about.

Think of this organization, this bureaucratic bunch that is starting over there. They want to double the amount or take two or three times the amount. You do not need them to go there. I will tell you that a lot of them would never go there and settle claims if I were running this Government. They ought to be sent some place else and given a job because I question whether any of them know what it is all about. You could get some Filipinos who are educated and who have been educated in the American schools and who live in the Philippines and who could do it for one-fourth or one-fifth of what it is going to cost us to do it.

Members of Congress, do you believe that we should build up this great organization here to go over and settle these claims now? That is the only reason I am trying to fight this bill. We are going to have a roll-call vote on this bill, and I do not want the majority leader to come over to find out how you are going to vote once you get a quorum here, and you might as well know that right now. I want to know how many fellows want to handle this in the right, the wise, the sensible, and judicious way or whether we are going to give these bureaucrats all they want. They had \$4,000,000,000, and they only spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Now, they want to double the money. Do you not think it is time for us to stop that? Let us stop them here, and let us do a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to stand alongside my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in the interest of economy.

We on the Committee on Foreign Affairs were asked for \$16,000,000 for administrative expenses for the Philippine War Damage Commission. I know that as one of Bob Rich's younger and newer members of the Pennsylvania delegation I was fighting for economy and, in fact, waged a battle to get this reduced from \$16,000,000 to \$8,400,000.

The reason was that the Navy went over there and handled their war damage claims, but the Navy's administration expenses were 1.8 percent instead of the 4 percent this Commission claimed to be necessary. There were certain items that the peacetime Philippine War Damage Commission felt they would have in their budget that the Navy did not. Both the chairman [Mr. WARING] and I separately estimated that amount at seven-tenths of 1 percent. So on that basis of computing administration expenses the amount would run between \$8,000,000 and \$10,000,000.

I oppose loose spending and therefore I do not think it would be unjust to say that an analogy to insurance claims is entirely out of order here, as these claims handled by large adjustment agencies are not comparable in the least.

If I understood the former chairman of the Interior Affairs Committee correctly, he said it might cost \$100,000,000 in the Philippines. If that is what he meant to say, that would be a gross waste of money. I do not think the expense of

this Commission during the 1948 fiscal year should run more than \$2,000,000.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I just want to correct the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BELL. I did not say it would cost \$100,000,000 to administer this matter. What I said was that if you did not give them a reasonable amount to administer it intelligently, we would probably lose \$100,000,000.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Now, may I explain the finances of the Commission for a minute? At the present time the Commission has a \$4,000,000 authorization for administration expense to take them through until 1951. They have spent during the fiscal year 1947, \$800,000 of it. They have just been appropriated this year, by conference on appropriations, \$2,000,000. So that they have spent to date \$2,800,000 out of the \$4,000,000. The Foreign Affairs Committee is asking you to give them a final figure of \$8,400,000 over this 4-year period to 1951.

The other body passed this bill in 5 minutes, and they gave them \$16,000,000, all that this Philippine War Damage Commission asked for. Then, when the Chairman of the Commission was cross-examined in our Foreign Affairs Committee, he admitted they had \$2,000,000 that they did not have budgeted. They wanted that as a cushion. So that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has cut this bill \$7,600,000 so far, and we are watching the purse strings.

May I finish by pointing out some committee amendments that I have put in. The first amendment is to prevent the paying of any of this money in damage claims to anybody in the Philippines who is a member of the Communist Party or advancing those particular ideas that do not accord with the democratic system. That is only fair.

The other amendment is to scan the Board itself to see that everybody on it is checked by the FBI before January 1, 1948, so that we know we have loyal citizens on this Commission.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I, too, as a member of the committee, was interested in achieving economies, and I think the gentleman from Minnesota was also interested in economy. I think there were quite a few members of the committee interested in economy.

Mr. FULTON. May I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], especially for being interested in economy. The membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously agreed on the reduced figure for administration expenses after extensive hearings.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, to get back to the bill under consideration, I want to remind the House that this bill does

not appropriate or authorize a single additional dollar. It provides that out of the \$400,000,000 already authorized for rehabilitation work in the Philippines by legislation passed last year, there shall be an increase from 1 percent to 2.1 percent for administrative expenses, that is, from \$4,000,000 to \$8,400,000, so that the Commission can do the best possible job in making sure that all claims are properly settled and the money well spent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this horrible picture that we have heard so much about, Duel in the Sun, is being imposed on the people of Washington again. I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD to show just what it means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence between myself and our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] on the accomplishments of the Un-American Activities Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report which I have written for the magazine The Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a report to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the membership on their generosity which made possible the raising of a large amount of money for the Metropolitan Boys Club of Washington.

First I wish to thank the membership, especially those who participated in playing the baseball game on July 12. Next I wish to report on how we carried out the mandate served by our gracious Speaker and our majority leader on us Republicans to win the ball game, which we did successfully by a score of 16 to 13.

We are grateful for the sportsmanship shown by our colleagues on the Democratic side. I am sure that when our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] challenged us to the game he wanted to win it and that he kept his promise of endeavoring to do everything possible to make a great showing for the House in this joint effort to raise money for the Boys Club.

I wish to thank Chief Justice Vinson of the United States Supreme Court for participating with us and tossing out the first ball.

I wish also to compliment our colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] who did such a fine job umpiring for us; our colleague from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] for his efforts on the publicity end; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL], finance, and the gentleman from Wisconsin who handled concessions, the gentleman from California, "Dr." POULSON, who added much to the entertainment of the afternoon, and the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman GILLIE, who so ably administered to the physical needs of the players.

Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the membership I insert at this point a list of the Members who participated in the ball game:

REPUBLICAN TEAM LINE-UP, CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME, JULY 12

CASE, South Dakota, left field.
JACKSON, California, third base.
DAVIS, Wisconsin, shortstop.
FLETCHER, California, right field.
HOWELL, Illinois, first base.
BISHOP, Illinois, second base.
STRATTON, Illinois, center field.
BROPHY, Wisconsin, catcher.
CORBETT, Pennsylvania, pitcher.
BOGGS, Delaware, pitcher.
WILSON, Indiana, pitcher.
HILL, Colorado, pitcher.
BUTLER, New York, pitcher.
MUNDT, South Dakota, pitcher.
Utility: HORAN, Washington; HAGEN, Minnesota; MACKINNON, Minnesota; LANDIS, Indiana; KEARNS, Pennsylvania; LOVE, West Virginia; SCOBELICK, Pennsylvania.
STOCKMAN, Oregon, umpire; MARTIN, Massachusetts, coach; HALLECK, Indiana, coach; SPRINGER, Indiana, coach; FLOESER, Missouri; KEARNEY, New York, publicity; KUNKEL, Pennsylvania, treasurer; BYRNES, Wisconsin, concessions; ARENDS, Illinois, whip.
Score, Democrats, 13; Republicans, 16.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague from Illinois in thanking those who participated in this ball game to make it a success. I appreciate their efforts very much.

I, too, insert in the RECORD at this point the names of Members who participated on my side:

DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN BASEBALL GAME FOR BENEFIT OF METROPOLITAN POLICE BOYS' CLUB OF WASHINGTON, JULY 12, 1947

1. ABERNETHY, THOMAS G., Mississippi.
2. ALBERT, CARL, Oklahoma.
3. BATTLE, LAURIE C., Alabama.
4. BRYSON, JOSEPH R., South Carolina.
5. CAMP, A. SIDNEY, Georgia.
6. COOLEY, HAROLD D., North Carolina.
7. DURHAM, CARL T., North Carolina.
8. EVINS, JOE L., Tennessee.
9. FOGARTY, JOHN E., Rhode Island.
10. GARY, J. VAUGHAN, Virginia.
11. GORE, ALBERT, Tennessee.
12. GOSSETT, ED, Texas.
13. GRANT, GEORGE M., Alabama.
14. HUBER, WALTER B., Ohio.
15. JACKSON, HENRY M., Washington.
16. JONES, ROBERT E., JR., Alabama.
17. KEFAUVER, ESTES, Tennessee.
18. PRICE, EMORY H., Florida.
19. PRIEST, J. PERCY, Tennessee.

20. RICHARDS, JAMES P., South Carolina.
21. RIVERS, L. MENDEL, South Carolina.
22. SMATHERS, GEORGE A., Florida.
23. STIGLER, WILLIAM G., Oklahoma.
24. WHEELER, W. M. (DON), Georgia.
25. WHITTEN, JAMIE L., Mississippi.
26. WORLEY, EUGENE, Texas.
27. LANHAM, HENDERSON, Georgia.
28. HARDY, PORTER, JR., Virginia.

The page boys.

I would like to give special mention to Fishbait Miller for the fine job he did in helping with the line-up and in various other ways.

I thank all the Members for the effort they put forth for the Boys' Club of Washington. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] will tell us in a minute just how much money was raised.

Mr. COOLEY. How about the umpire?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Yes; a word of thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] who represented us so ably on the field as umpire as he had the difference on the field.

Also I wish to thank the gentleman from Alabama, GEORGE GRANT, who looked after the sale of refreshments on the Democratic side. Also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] who was the champion peanut salesman. We are grateful to them all.

I think it should be observed at this point in regard to the score which the gentleman from Illinois mentioned which was 16 to 13, but if the rain had not knocked the Democrats out of their last bat it would have been a different story.

Mr. WORLEY. I am sure everyone understands that the score would have been different had we had our last bat.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Naturally the score would have been entirely different. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. It seemed to me that sometime during the game somebody knocked a home run.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Yes. We will not say anything about who was playing center field at the time. You have all heard of "Wrong Way" Corrigan.

Mr. KNUTSON. That home run was an optical illusion.

Mr. ARENDS. Without making it a matter of record, can the gentleman tell us whether or not the ball was ever recovered?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. The ball was found after about 10 or 15 minutes. Of course, Mr. COOLEY made the slight mistake of running toward second base when he should have run for the bleachers.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without thanking the authorities in charge for so freely giving us the use of the Eastern High School facilities to do a little practicing and also for the valuable assistance given to us by Coach Geigon. He helped us very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania very briefly that he may make his financial report.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the net total profit to date is \$2,927.03. I just collected \$10 since the festivities started. The cash sales were \$3,197. That consisted of money paid in for tickets by

Members plus \$188 which came from the Touchdown Club of Washington, headed by Mr. Robert C. Simmons. This organization participated in the ticket sales to that extent. All of us appreciate their fine cooperation greatly.

The sales at the stadium gate were \$329. The net profits from concessions were \$119.25, the total receipts being \$3,645.25.

We also did a good job for the United States Treasury because the tax on tickets amounted to \$596.02. This was by far the largest item of expense.

All the other expenses were very small. The Washington stadium, under the direction of Clark Griffith, not only let us have the stadium free, but also supplied a great many facilities, including the ticket sellers at the windows and numerous other small items which saved a great deal of money and enabled the net profit to be much higher than it otherwise would have been.

It may be we will take in some more money between now and adjournment because on each of the last few days I have received checks from Members who had forgotten to send them in. If any of you have overlooked the letter we will be glad to have you mail your checks this afternoon. They will be added to the check that is being sent to the Metropolitan Boys Club. With the tremendous rush of business on the floor and in committee during the past weeks, inevitably a percentage would overlook this payment.

The complete statement of receipts and expenses is as follows:

Statement of receipts and expenses, congressional baseball game, Griffith Stadium, July 12, 1947

RECEIPTS	
Tickets:	
Cash sales.....	\$3,197.00
Griffith Stadium sales.....	329.00
Total.....	3,426.00
Profit—concessions at Griffith Stadium.....	119.25
Total receipts.....	3,645.25
EXPENSES	
Tax on tickets.....	\$596.02
Mimeographing and envelopes.....	2.80
Printing, 25,000 tickets.....	61.50
Griffith Stadium expense:	
Scoreboard.....	\$2.00
Maids.....	8.00
Soda, clubhouse.....	8.40
3 dozen baseballs, at \$16.50 a dozen.....	49.50
	67.90
Total expenses.....	728.22
Profit.....	2,917.03
Statement prepared July 25, 1947.	

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats lost but the Republicans were the last to bat. Next year there will be other controversies and conflicts coming on and the Democrats would like to challenge the Republicans to a real game in 1948.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. KNUTSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(but only until July 1, 1948, in the case of paper in rolls of less than 15 inches in width)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Existing law (par. 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930) admits free of duty "standard newsprint paper". The House joint resolution amended this paragraph so as to provide that paper which is in rolls not less than 15 inches in width shall be deemed to be standard newsprint insofar as width of rolls is concerned. Senate amendment No. 1 limits the application of the amendment made by the House to the period ending June 30, 1948; and Senate amendment No. 2, changes the width of the permissible rolls from 15 to 9 inches.

The House recedes on amendment No. 2, and recedes on amendment No. 1, with an amendment the effect of which is to make the 15-inch width permissible as permanent law, but to make the 9-inch width permissible only until July 1, 1948.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the Resolution 238, to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATION OF WARTIME TAX PROVISIONS

Mr. KNUTSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, and agree to the same.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill provided that for the purposes of the proviso of section 511 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the present war shall be considered as having terminated on the fifteenth day after the date of the enactment of the bill. The Senate amendment provides that for such purposes the present war shall be considered as having terminated on March 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill amended section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to terminate on December 31, 1947, the income-tax exclusion of \$1,500 of service pay now allowed to commissioned officers or commissioned warrant officers serving in the armed forces of the United States and to citizens or residents of the United States serving in the armed forces of any of the other United Nations. The Senate amendment provides that such income-tax exclusion shall not terminate until December 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The House bill amended section 22 (b) (13) of the code so as to terminate on December 31, 1947, the income-tax exclusion of all service pay allowed under existing law to personnel serving in the armed forces of the United States below the grade of commissioned officer (or commissioned warrant officer). The Senate amendment provides that such income-tax exclusion shall not terminate until December 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: The House bill amended section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the code which makes special provisions, in the case of taxpayers using the last-in first-out method for income-tax reporting, for replacement of inventories depleted by involuntary liquidation because of circumstances related to the war. Section 8 of the House bill provided that the relief under section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the code is allowable if the involuntary liquidation occurred in a taxable year beginning prior to August 1, 1947 (instead of prior to the termination of the war), and the replacement occurred in a taxable year ending prior to August 1, 1950 (instead of not more than three years after the termination of the war). Amendment No. 4 substitutes for the date August 1, 1947,

the date January 1, 1948; and amendment No. 5 substitutes for the date August 1, 1950, the date January 1, 1951. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The House bill amended section 1621 (a) of the code by striking out paragraph (1) thereof which excludes from the definition of wages, and hence from withholding of income tax at source, remuneration for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States. The House bill provided that the amendment striking out paragraph (1) should be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1948. The Senate amendment provides that such amendment shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1949. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of bauxite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of pyrophyllite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of phosphate rock for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of trona for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment provides, with respect to percentage depletion, that "In the case of potash and thenardite, whether extracted from a mine or from a brine or other deposit, there shall be included in gross and net income from the property the income from other minerals or mineral salts extracted therefrom." The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 17: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: The Senate amendment adds a section 16 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House. Section 23 (q) (2) of the code provides that contributions or gifts (for religious, charitable, educational, etc., purposes) made by a corporation to an unincorporated association (trust, chest, fund, or foundation) are not deductible if made within a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946 (the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President) unless such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions. The Senate amendment adding section 16 to the bill amends section 23 (q) (2) so that the requirement that such gifts or contributions must be used within the United States or any of its possessions is applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948, instead of December 31, 1946, as provided under existing law. The House recedes.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. COOPER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report signed by all of the conferees. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the chairman of our committee make an explanation to the House of the action of the conferees. I think it is important enough to do that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understood we finally disposed of the matter. I think the gentleman has reference to the \$1,500 exemption for servicemen, is that correct?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. We accepted the Senate amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand, as the measure left the House, the exemptions that the armed services personnel held since 1943 were removed. It was provided in the 1943 act that no enlisted man would be charged an individual income tax on any pay received, and the armed services personnel and commissioned class were entitled to a \$1,500 exemption. As it left the House, this exemption was removed; is that correct?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not as far as the enlisted personnel was concerned. It only was removed from the officer personnel. The Senate restored the officer personnel, and that amendment was accepted in conference.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the chairman will agree with me that the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was the position adopted by the Senate on this bill, and that provision was agreed to in conference.

Mr. KNUTSON. The will of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania prevailed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just thought it would be interesting to the House to know that the armed services personnel will still have the same exemptions as they have been enjoying for the past four or five years.

Mr. KNUTSON. They will continue to enjoy a favored status over all other citizens.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That exemption will continue through 1948?

Mr. KNUTSON. To 1949.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a summary of the history of the Committee on Ways and Means during this session of the Congress.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bills H. R. 2659 and 2173 may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on those bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 3045 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RETURNS OF ITALIAN PROPERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas article 79 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947, grants to the Allied and Associated Powers the right to seize and retain "all property rights and interests which on the coming into force of the present treaty are within its territory and belong to Italy or to Italian nationals, and to apply such property or the proceeds thereof to such purposes as it may desire, within the limits of its claims and those of its nationals against Italy or Italian nationals, including debts, other than claims fully satisfied under other articles of the present treaty" and further provides that "All Italian property, or the proceeds thereof, in excess of the amount of such claims, shall be returned"; and

Whereas pursuant to article 79 of the treaty of peace, negotiations have been entered into between the Governments of the United States and of Italy looking toward an agreement under which, upon the return of property, formerly Italian, in the United States, Italy will place at the disposal of the United States funds to be used in meeting certain claims of nationals of the United States; and

Whereas for the purpose of carrying out such agreement, it is desirable to authorize in accordance with the procedures provided for in section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, return to Italy or citizens or subjects of Italy, or corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy, of

property vested in or transferred to the United States or its agencies; and

Whereas for the purpose of aiding the revival of the Italian economy and establishing it on a self-sustaining basis, it is desirable that there be returned or transferred to Italy those Italian vessels acquired by the United States after December 7, 1941, for use in the war effort and now owned by the United States and vessels of a total tonnage approximately equal to the tonnage of those Italian vessels seized by the United States after September 1, 1939, and lost while being employed in the United States war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, is hereby authorized to return, in accordance with the procedures provided for in section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, any property or interest, or the net proceeds thereof, which has been, since December 18, 1941, vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the United States pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and which immediately prior to such vesting or transfer was the property or interest of Italy or a citizen or subject of Italy, or a corporation or association organized under the laws of Italy.

Sec. 2. Section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(2) that such owner, and legal representative or successor in interest, if any, are not—

"(A) the Government of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania; or

"(B) a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation: *Provided*, That any property or interest or proceeds which, but for the provisions of this subdivision (B), might be returned under this section to any such corporation or association, may be returned to the owner or owners of all the stock of such corporation or of all the proprietary and beneficial interest in such association, if their ownership of such stock or proprietary and beneficial interest existed immediately prior to vesting in or transfer to the Alien Property Custodian and continuously thereafter to the date of such return (without regard to purported divestments or limitations of such ownership by any government referred to in subdivision (A) hereof) and if such ownership was by one or more citizens of the United States or by one or more corporations organized under the laws of the United States or any State, Territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That such owner or owners shall succeed to those obligations limited in aggregate amount to the value of such property or interest or proceeds, which are lawfully assertible against the corporation or association by persons not ineligible to receive a return under this section; or

"(C) an individual voluntarily resident at any time since December 7, 1941, within the territory of such nation, other than a citizen of the United States or a diplomatic or consular officer of Italy or of any nation with which the United States has not at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war: *Provided*, That an individual who, while in the territory of a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, was deprived of life or substantially deprived of liberty pursuant to any law, decree, or regulation of such nation discriminating against political, racial, or religious groups, shall not be deemed to have voluntarily resided in such territory; or

"(D) an individual who was at any time after December 7, 1941, a citizen or subject of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, and who on or after December 7,

1941, and prior to the date of the enactment of this section, was present (other than in the service of the United States) in the territory of such nation or in any territory occupied by the military or naval forces thereof or engaged in any business in any such territory: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (D) return may be made to an individual who, as a consequence of any law, decree, or regulation of the nation of which he was then a citizen or subject, discriminating against political, racial, or religious groups, has at no time between December 7, 1941, and the time when such law, decree, or regulation was abrogated, enjoyed full rights of citizenship under the law of such nation; or

"(E) a foreign corporation or association which at any time after December 7, 1941, was controlled or 50 percent or more of the stock of which was owned by any person or persons ineligible to receive a return under subdivisions (A), (B), (C), or (D) hereof: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (e), return may be made to a corporation or association so controlled or owned, if such corporation or association was organized under the laws of a nation any of whose territory was occupied by the military or naval forces of any nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, and if such control or ownership arose after March 1, 1938, as an incident to such occupation and was terminated prior to the enactment of this section; and"

Sec. 3. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 33. No return may be made pursuant to section 9 (a) or 32 (a) unless notice of claim for return has been filed within 2 years from the seizure or vesting in the Alien Property Custodian, as the case may be, of the property or interest in respect of which the claim is made or by August 8, 1948, or in the cases of claims pursuant to section 32 (a) by Italy, citizens or subjects of Italy, or corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy, by July 31, 1949, whichever is later."

Sec. 4. The President is authorized upon such terms as he deems necessary (a) to transfer to the Government of Italy all vessels which were under Italian registry and flag on September 1, 1939, and were thereafter acquired by the United States and are now owned by the United States; and (b) with respect to any vessel under Italian registry and flag on September 1, 1939, and subsequently seized in United States ports and thereafter lost while being employed in the United States war effort, to transfer to the Government of Italy surplus merchant vessels of the United States of a total tonnage approximately equal to the total tonnage of the Italian vessels lost: *Provided*, That no monetary compensation shall be paid either for the use by the United States or its agencies of former Italian vessels so acquired or seized or for the return or transfer of such vessels or substitute vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RICH. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. RICH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation requires no appropriation at all. It is a significant step toward the reha-

bilitation of a country which is undergoing grave difficulties, the repercussions of which are of vital concern to this country. We must do all that we can to bolster this Nation and help her to remain a bastion of liberty rather than an outpost of communism.

This is not only a matter of our own national self-interest, it is in the interest of world peace. Moreover, it is in line with the policy we adopted following the surrender of Fascist Italy on September 8, 1943, when we granted Italy belligerent status and guaranteed the essential nationhood of that country. This legislation will help to relieve the burden imposed by the Italian treaty recently ratified.

The headlong rapidity of events in Europe, the withdrawal of the Russian Government from participation in the Paris Conference, the large-scale attacks on war-ravaged and destitute Greece, and other disturbing manifestations of Soviet expansionism, make it urgent that we do all that we can to give assistance to Italy at this critical time. It is known that there are strong, violent elements in the Communist Party in Italy and they have ample means for fomenting serious disturbances which might well result in the capture by armed force of the Italian Government.

Accordingly, the passage of this resolution is urgent, aside from the material aid it will bring to Italy. It is important also as a further gesture of our determination to resist the antifreedom imperialism which has its headquarters in Moscow.

In addition, this legislation has been recommended most eloquently by our distinguished Secretary of State, who regards it as a very important and vital matter in the conduct of the foreign policy of our country.

Now I should like to say a few words with respect to the safeguarding of the rights and claims of American citizens who may have been injured or whose property may have been damaged as a result of the war with Italy. As you may know, since the Paris Peace Conference it has been the policy of this Government to effectuate as soon as possible the return to Italy of Italian properties in the United States which can be retained under the provisions of article 79 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy. As a matter of fact, the reparations demanded of Italy during the Paris Peace Conference were some \$22,000,000,000, and we were accused of wanting to keep Italian property in the United States in order to obtain reparations from Italy. Accordingly, in order to obtain this reduction, first from \$22,000,000,000 to \$750,000,000, and finally down to \$360,000,000, we said at Paris that we would not regard Italian property in this country as a reparations payment to us. The burden of reparations on Italy is a burden which inevitably falls to some extent on us, and, therefore, this was a very wise thing to have done. The national interest was served in this reduction of reparations payments.

In view of the fact that our Government has generously waived its claims under section 79 of the treaty it is appropriate to inquire if the claims of

American nationals are adequately protected.

First, let us consider the claims of American nationals with respect to properties in Italy which may have been confiscated or damaged by wartime action. These claims are safeguarded by article 78 of the Peace Treaty which provides, first, that all property rights and interests of American citizens in Italy must be restored to their owners free of all encumbrances and charges, and, second, that the Italian Government is responsible for such restoration in good order or for compensation in Italian lira to the extent of two-thirds of the sum necessary to repair the damage. With respect to this category of claims, the Italian Government has confirmed these obligations by an exchange of letters and, of course, there is an agreement covering this matter which will be signed very soon and the substance of which has already been agreed to.

Then, there are claims of American civilians for personal injuries, and maltreatment of prisoners of war in Italy. As to this no claims have been received. The agreement which is being negotiated provides for \$5,000,000 to cover all claims. The indications are that this sum will be more than twice the amount necessary to cover the claims. More than 2 years have elapsed since VE-day and the amount of claims already received after due publicity in the Federal Register indicates that \$5,000,000 will be ample to cover the claims of American nationals.

With respect to claims of American oil companies in Italy whose factories and plants in Italy have been seriously damaged, further agreements have been made so that they will be satisfied.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I understand that United States oil companies have had their property restored, is that right?

Mr. LODGE. I am interested to have this information.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that the oil companies have had their property returned to them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Returned to them.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that it was their own property that was returned to them and they have their own property back that was taken from them.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to have that contribution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is the information I have, that the property has been returned to the oil companies.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman.

Aside from this question of claims, there is this vital matter with respect to the ships which are to be transferred under this act. The tonnage lost is estimated to be approximately 140,000 tons. To this tonnage should be added 60,000 to 70,000 tons, representing ships previously confiscated and still afloat, which will be returned to Italy by this legisla-

tion. In this category are included five Italian ships confiscated by Latin-American countries, which were purchased by the United States, which served their purpose and which are now idle.

With respect to the Liberty ships to be transferred, it should be noted that there are some 400 or 500 Liberty ships which are now laid up and which have an estimated scrap value of \$10,000 to \$50,000 per ship. Each of those ships would require from \$50,000 to \$200,000 in the way of repairs, in order to put them in satisfactory operating order. But it is contemplated that those ships will be transferred to Italy on an "as is—where is" basis. Those ships will be selected by the President of the United States in consultation with the maritime commission. In this way it is hoped that only the better available ships will be transferred.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I would like to ask my colleague, regarding the transfer of the Liberty ships to Italy, if the Maritime Commission has approved the transfer of those ships. The reason I ask that question is that I know certain other countries are anxious to obtain Liberty ships and I understand, whether I am informed correctly or not, there is trouble in getting the maritime commission to authorize the transfer to other countries.

Mr. LODGE. I am informed by the State Department that that matter has been taken care of. In fact, this entire matter has been cleared with the Alien Property Custodian, as well as the Treasury Department.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman tell the House whether Italy, under the peace treaty, is obligated to make reparation payments to other countries?

Mr. LODGE. Under the peace treaty Italy is obligated to make reparation payments to other countries, but those payments are made in the following fashion—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Russia, for instance, will ship in raw materials to Italy, and Italian labor will transform those raw materials into finished products, which will be shipped out to Russia. It involves no expenditure of raw materials on the part of Italy.

Mr. BUCK. Then, conceivably, some of this fund can go to other countries?

Mr. LODGE. This fund cannot go to Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, if those countries are successors in ownership. There are provisions in the bill which cover that entire situation. With respect to reparations, the situation is as I have described.

There are between 15 and 18 Liberty ships involved in this transfer. We have eight additional ships in our possession which we are going to transfer. There

are, as I have said, also five ships which we purchased from Brazil and Venezuela.

It should be pointed out that at the end of the war the Italian merchant marine was left with one-tenth of its prewar tonnage. That is to say, 300,000 tons instead of 3,000,000 tons, and many of those losses were sustained during the period of cobelligerency with the United Nations. Furthermore, a number of Italian ships were operated by the Allied forces during this period, thereby causing the Italian Government considerable sacrifice in connection with their operations.

Examples of these are the ships *Vulcania* and *Saturnia* which were used as hospital ships. It is estimated that the Italian economy on the basis of the present exchange situation will make a net currency profit of \$15,000,000 per annum if these ships are transferred to her; and if not it will cost them \$21,000,000 per annum. Accordingly, a net gain of \$36,000,000 is involved.

We recently passed a bill which gave Italy \$130,000,000 in relief. We know how costly it is to transport that relief overseas. We know that the great difficulty in Italy is lack of foreign exchange. This will put Italy in a position where she can gain some much needed foreign exchange.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this legislation will receive favorable action at this time. I regard it as of the utmost importance.

The question as to whether the return of Italian vested property to the former Italian owners will jeopardize American claimants has been one which I have gone into thoroughly. It is possible to break down American claimants into three major categories: First, Americans who have claims against Italy because of damage to the property in Italy or Italian control of these Americans either as a result of war activities or arising out of the controls imposed by the Italian Government during its period of belligerency against us; second, claims of Americans directly against the property which is to be returned or claims which they may have against the Italian owners of the property to be returned; and, third, special claims of Americans against Italy arising out of the war and which are not otherwise satisfied under the terms of the treaty of peace which has been ratified by the Senate.

A thorough examination of this Government's policy with respect to these three categories of claims reveals that the present legislation will not jeopardize the claimants' position or the means which they may have to satisfy their claims. I have considered it necessary to go into these questions with the appropriate Government agencies—State, Justice, Treasury—in order that I could be certain that by taking this action we will not be injuring the rights of our nationals. I am firmly convinced that the results of my investigations fully substantiate the conclusion that the enactment of this legislation will not prejudice the rights or claims of those Americans.

With respect to the first type of claims, article 78 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy requires the Italian Government

to restore all property rights and interests held by nationals of the United States to such nationals. It further requires that the property shall be returned to complete good order, or if that is not possible, that compensation shall be paid for that part of the property which cannot be returned in complete good order. Using this provision as a basis, the Department of State, in conjunction with other interested agencies, is currently negotiating an agreement with the Italian Government which further insures that the property of American nationals will be returned in good order, or in the event that the property has been so damaged that that is not possible, compensation will be paid. In this connection difficult cases which have arisen over the past 2 years with respect to the return of property in Italy of American nationals in Italy, have been reviewed and full agreement has been reached satisfactory not only to our Government but to the nationals concerned which will make possible the immediate return of such property and the immediate payment of compensation, if such is required. In other words, the American national who owns property in Italy will, in the immediate future, either receive that property back in complete good order and free of all encumbrances which may have been placed upon it while it was under the control of the Italian Government, or in the event that the property cannot be restored to complete good order, he will immediately in the future receive compensation. The fact that the American nationals who have interests in Italy falling into this category are fully satisfied with the terms of the agreement that is being worked out, is sufficient answer to any doubts that may be raised that we are jeopardizing the rights of those Americans by returning Italian vested property.

The second category of claims deals with the claims of American nationals which lie directly against the property which is to be returned or claims against the Italian owners of the property to be returned. The present legislation in and of itself assures that the claims of these American nationals will not be prejudiced. This is necessarily so because the present legislation in every detail uses the same procedures for returning to Italy and Italian nationals their vested properties as this Congress has already deemed satisfactory for the return to other nations and their nationals. This means, therefore, that before vested property can be returned to the Italian owners the Office of Alien Property of the Department of Justice must publish notice in the Federal Register that such property is being returned and must give notice to the claimants that they may pursue their usual legal remedies by attachment or otherwise against that property in order that they may be assured that their claim or claims which are deemed legitimate by our courts will be satisfied. Therefore, these American nationals are in no different position than they would have been if the Italian property had never been vested, with one exception. That exception is that had the property never been vested they might

never have had the opportunity of knowing that the property was in this country, and therefore might never have had the opportunity to attach the property. However, they are now giving formal notice as required by the Congress that the property is in this country and that in the near future it is to be returned to the Italian owners. Therefore, section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended by this legislation, if anything, puts these claimants in a better position, since they have a more adequate opportunity of pursuing their claims against the Italian owners. Under these circumstances there certainly can be no question that the enactment of the present legislation would jeopardize the claims of American nationals falling into this category.

The third category of the claims which may be held by American nationals deals with the special meritorious claims arising out of the war and not otherwise covered by the treaty of peace. With respect to this category, we are talking primarily of the small number of claims for injuries to American civilians in Italy arising out of the war or claims for maltreatment of Americans while prisoners of war of the Italian armed forces. I say "small number" for clear and obvious reasons: First, The Italian authorities never pursued, as did Germany and Japan, a policy of maltreating our American prisoners of war. It is well-known that the Italian armed forces to the fullest extent possible followed the rules of international law with respect to the treatment of their prisoners of war; it is very well-known that they never stooped to the inhumane policy of the Germans of maltreating prisoners of war. That this is so is borne out by the fact that no claims have been filed for such maltreatment. The same applies with respect to American civilians who may have been injured or killed in Italy during the war. During the war the Italians allowed American civilians to pursue their usual course of life in Italy. Those who were under suspicion or against whom there was evidence of working for the Americans against Italy were, in accordance with the usual rules of international law and in the same manner as this Government acted, interned by the Italian Government. The treatment they received, however, as internees was consistent and in accordance with the principles of international law. Moreover, these cases were few in number. Therefore, the type of claim that might arise in this category would be the claim of an American who may have been injured by actual warfare in Italy. In view of the fact that the number of Americans in Italy during the war were few and in view of the fact that to date no claim has been filed in this category, it is clear that we need not fear any large number of such claims.

I wish to stress this last point. Considerable publicity was given in the United States to the negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference. The United States press was full of reports that we were in fact determining at the Paris conference what should be done with respect to claims against Italy. Similarly, such publicity was given to the delibera-

tions of the Senate over the ratification of the Italian Treaty of Peace. Once again the United States press carried full reports concerning the terms of the treaty: the fact that the treaty laid down the rules for satisfying the claims of Americans against Italy. Considerable publicity was given—and is still being given—to the fact that there is now in the United States an economic and financial mission which is negotiating with our Government an executive agreement to settle issues which remain outstanding under the terms of the Treaty of Peace with Italy. The press of the United States has carried numerous reports on these negotiations, but despite all this publicity, I am informed that no large number of claims of any important monetary value have been filed with our Government. We can easily compare this experience with the experience we have had in other cases. When the Yugoslav Government sent a delegation to the United States to work out an agreement on similar questions, a large and considerable number of Americans notified their Government of claims they held against Yugoslavia. The American is quick to realize the possibility of satisfying his claims and making his claims known to the Government. This, therefore, means that in order to satisfy such claims, which are in the category of claims not settled by the treaty of peace, only a very small amount of money is required. On the basis of this evidence, I would be willing to say that anywhere from one to \$3,000,000 would be adequate. However, in order to make assurance doubly sure, our Government is requiring in these current negotiations with the Italians the payment by Italy to the United States in the immediate future, of \$5,000,000 in American currency which is to be utilized for the satisfaction of these special claims. Under these circumstances there can be no doubt that this amount is more than adequate, and this is a lump sum payment and the entire amount is made available to us. This procedure affords clear advantages to the American national who, if he has such a claim, does not, as is the usual rule under mixed claims commissions and the like, have to satisfy both the foreign government and this Government as to the merits of his claim. He need only deal with this Government and need only present his evidence to this Government, and upon its being satisfied that his claim is a meritorious claim, the money is ready and available for payment to him. The Government of Italy has nothing to say about it. Therefore, I believe it is clear that the enactment of this resolution will not in any way jeopardize the possibilities of the American national who holds such claims against Italy in obtaining satisfaction; on the contrary, under the executive agreement now being worked out, his ability to effect satisfaction of that type of claim will be enhanced. At this point I should like to point out that although this agreement has not been formally signed, the Italian Government has already given its approval to it. The signature is only a matter of typing up the final documents.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summarizing, therefore, the effect of this legislation upon all the possible claims that American nationals might have against Italy or the Italian owners of property in this country, we can say the following:

First. Under the terms of the Treaty of Peace and under the terms of the agreement which has been worked between the two Governments, the American national who owns property in Italy is being dealt with in a manner which is fully satisfactory to his Government and to him.

Second. The American national who holds a claim against Italian property in this country is being given a better opportunity than he would otherwise have of obtaining satisfaction of that claim upon his proving in the usual manner in the courts that his claim is a meritorious one; and

Third. The American national who has a special claim against Italy arising out of the war is being assured that there will be money available for the payment of that claim and that it can be handled in an expeditious manner without any reference to the foreign government.

I should like to point out one basic reason why I think it is essential that the House pass this resolution now. When the United States delegation went to the Paris Peace Conference, they had two basic policies with respect to the question of reparations against Italy. The first was that the reparations should not be onerous or burdensome—that Italy could not possibly meet such claims. In other words, it was the intention of this Government that Italy, rather than remaining a country which could not possibly continue on a self-sufficient basis, should be restored to an economic vitality which would assure not only a democratic government in Italy, not only the absence of the need of aid from the United States, but also an Italy which would be able to contribute in a positive manner to world peace.

The second basic policy of this Government was that the reparation formula should not be one which would require this Government to give aid to Italy in order that it could pay off its reparation claims to other countries.

In the very beginning our negotiators had to face the following facts: Twenty-two billion dollars worth of reparation claims were filed against Italy by other governments. Clearly and obviously such a huge amount could not under any circumstances be paid out by Italy. By continuous argument and by constantly pressing forward in the most convincing manner possible the arguments against such a large reparations claim being approved by the conference, this Government was able, as the conference was drawing to a close, to reduce that \$22,000,000,000 worth of claims to \$760,000,000 worth. However, this, too, was considered an unreasonable amount to charge against Italy. It was clear that if this amount was approved by the Paris peace negotiators, Italy would have no possibility of establishing a satisfactory economic and political future for itself. Our negotiators therefore made it very clear to the other governments that we

were not going to ask for any reparations against Italy. When we were accused of the intention of using Italian assets in the United States as a means of satisfying in a concealed way our reparation claims against Italy, we pressed forward with all vigor by stating our clear-cut intention of returning by far the greater portion of these assets. We made it very clear that while we were knocking down the reparation claims of other countries and while we were holding forth our position of not seeking reparations against Italy, we did not intend in any way or under any guise to use Italian assets in this country to meet our own claims. By making these arguments we were able, therefore, to reduce the amount of reparation claims against Italy as it now stands in the treaty of peace, to \$360,000,000. We started with \$22,000,000,000 and we have succeeded in ending up with \$360,000,000; but we did this only by assuring the other governments that we were not going to obtain reparations from Italy and that we would return the greater part of the Italian assets in this country to Italy.

Were this House now to take a policy different from that which proved so successful to the Paris Peace Conference negotiators, the consequences will be disastrous. I believe it would be a grave mistake for us to jeopardize this settlement by acting inconsistently with the strongly and publicly stated policies of our Government.

Further than that our failure to pass this legislation will have a lamentable psychological and political effect on the Italian people. It is vital that Italy remain on the right side of the iron curtain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I am confining myself largely to the question of the ships involved. A letter from the Under Secretary refers to two categories. There are really, as I see it, three categories of ships. The first relates to eight ships which have been seized by this country and which we undertook to return to the Government of Italy. Second, 5 ships which have been purchased by this Government from Brazil and Venezuela and which we undertook to return to Italy; and, third, 18 vessels seized prior to December 7, 1941, subsequently requisitioned by the United States for use in the war effort and thereafter lost.

What we are doing in the second category, as I have it, is this; we are taking five ships that were taken by Brazil and Venezuela which were of Italian registry. We bought those five ships from Brazil and Venezuela. We paid cash for them. We now propose to give those same five ships back to Italy.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Will the gentleman tell us what we paid for those ships?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am not sure that I have the entire amount here that we paid for them.

The valuation of the 18 ships in the third category is also, I am sorry to say, not available; but the official cost of building a Liberty ship was about \$1,728,000. We undertook to replace the Italian ships which have been lost with Liberty ships at a million and three-quarters.

But I want to speak in particular about those five ships we bought from Brazil and Venezuela. We bought those ships. We gave Brazil and Venezuela cash. Now we plan to give the ships back to Italy; and I think the House should know that Brazil and Venezuela have also given the cash back to Italy. So the Italian Government will be in receipt of both the ships and the cash, and the American Government will be in receipt of nothing whatsoever. That seems to me to be somewhat too generous to Italy in view of the fact that while we are returning the larger part of Italian assets in the United States to Italy we are not clearly protecting our American citizens from any claims which they may have to the Italian assets because while we are reserving \$5,000,000 to take care of American citizens there is no evidence before us as to how much the claims of American citizens will be or whether that will be adequate.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. As I understand, the plan is to give the Italian Government Liberty ships now controlled by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. That is my understanding.

Mr. BONNER. Can the gentleman show us under what authority this can be done? Under what system or arrangement can we take ships from the Maritime Commission and give them to the Italian Government when we already have legislation authorizing the Maritime Commission to sell these ships?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. You cannot do it unless this joint resolution is adopted.

Mr. BONNER. Does it amend the Ships Sales Act as passed by this House?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. It has the effect of that. It amends the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917. It does not precisely state that it amends the Ships Sales Act, but that certainly would be the effect of it, in my opinion. The concern I have is whether or not we are being too anxious to take care of the Italian Government before we take care of the claims of American citizens of Italian or other origin who have claims.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, according to the testimony given before the Deficiency Committee just a few days ago by the Maritime Commission, we were told they will have approximately 7,200 ships to be disposed of, some of which are Liberty ships and LST's. They also indicated it is going to cost more money to take care of the repairs, reconditioning, guarding, and so forth of these ships

than we will get for them through ultimate sale. I have the information, questioning the officials of the Maritime Commission, that an LST boat cost more than a Liberty ship. I was told that a Liberty ship cost approximately \$1,500,000 and that the junk value would be approximately \$75,000, that an LST cost originally \$1,700,000 and the junk value, they estimate, may be \$75,000, perhaps less.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee where they get the information that the junk value of these Liberty ships is \$10,000, what condition these ships are in, and so forth?

Of course, the price depends upon the condition of the ship.

Mr. HINSHAW. The information obtained by the committee is from a letter written by the Under Secretary of State, Robert H. Lovett, dated July 19, 1947, in which he says:

With respect to the Liberty ships the official figures which have been released concerning the estimated cost of building a Liberty ship are: Estimated prewar cost, \$1,278,000; estimated wartime cost, \$1,728,590.

Mr. STEFAN. There is not very much difference between the original cost figures I gave and the figures the gentleman gives me. The testimony in our committee, however, does not jibe with the figures and information we are now getting.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will quote that if the gentleman will give me the opportunity:

We are also advised that the scrap value of Liberty ships is as low as \$10,000 each, while the maximum scrap of any Liberty ship does not exceed \$50,000.

That is where the information of the committee came from.

Mr. STEFAN. There is apparent difference of information between the Department of State and the Maritime Commission. The departments should get together on facts so Congress can get some reliable information.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know that.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, I want to ask another question. A young man who told me that he is an American citizen claims he has a large claim which may be affected by this bill. He mentioned a large amount and stated he would be very happy to take one or two of those Liberty ships for this claim. Can the gentleman give me some explanation of that? I do not know the details, but I want to help American citizens. I have no sympathy for our former enemies. The death of our soldiers in Italy is too fresh in my mind. I cannot forget that Italy fought against us. So I want to know now, before this bill is passed, whether or not American citizens are being protected.

Mr. HINSHAW. American citizens certainly are being protected. They have the right, which they always had, to file their claims against the Italian Government and they are protected pursuant to a memorandum of agreement.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman believe that this particular American citizen will be protected under this bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. I do.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. With reference to whether or not the American citizen is protected, I want to read a paragraph from a letter that the Department of Justice wrote me July 23. It says:

Information concerning the identity of the persons believed to have been the former owners of the larger items of Italian property now held by the Office of Alien Property has already been sent you. It is estimated by the Office of Alien Property that approximately 45 percent of the property which will be returnable if Senate Joint Resolution 133 is adopted was formerly owned by corporations and approximately 55 percent by individuals and partnerships.

Also I quote the pertinent part of a State Department letter, written July 24:

There is no information on file in the Department of State * * * of an American national having claims against Italy arising out of personal injury * * * or maltreatment while prisoners of war in cases of members of our armed forces.

Mr. STEFAN. All I want to know is whether or not American citizens are protected. Does the gentleman believe they are?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No claims, says the State Department, have been filed by any American citizens. They have no record of any whatsoever.

Mr. STEFAN. This legislation is being rushed through too quickly. More accurate information should be given to the Congress before this is enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Further, in relation to the question of the protection of American citizens, this letter is from the Department of State, dated July 24. It says:

At the present time there is no information on file in the Department of State or to its knowledge in any Government agency of an American national having claims against Italy arising out of personal injury in the case of civilians or maltreatment while prisoners of war in cases of members of our armed forces.

In answer to a question along this line which I asked one of the witnesses from the State Department he said that he knew of no instances where American citizens have filed claims. He further said that no information has been given out by the State Department to the effect that if American citizens filed claims there would be a way by which they could recover.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take the time of the House on a question such as we have here, but I took an oath of office to support the Constitution of the United States, and when I came here to Congress I made up my mind that I was going to try to do the best I knew

how to try to operate the Government for the benefit of the American people.

We were dragged into a war that we did not want to get into. We have been in two of them in the last 20 years, and we never should have been in either one of them. But, now, since we have gotten into this last one, we have gotten to the point, as I see it, where we think we should be the guardian angels of every nation in the world, and I do not believe that we ever intended to be that and I do not believe that we can ever be that. We have got a great job to look after our own country. Some people think that after you get into a war and you win the war that you have got to do everything that we are trying to do with the money of the people of America, who are keeping their noses down to the grindstone at almost every turn, to help out with solving the problems of all the world. I do not think that that is our business and I, for one, am not going to assume that responsibility. I think if our State Department can help these countries in certain ways, that we ought to try to do it—work with them—be good friends. But, when it comes to a time that we are going to drag America down, and all the American institutions with it, then I want to tell you that it is time to get up here and fight, and that is just what I am trying to do today. I am fighting to save America from going into bankruptcy.

We got these vessels from Italy. We brought them over here or used them over there. Venezuela and Brazil took the ships belonging to Italy that were in their harbors. After we got started in the war, Uncle Sam, the great benefactor, went down to Venezuela and Brazil and bought the ships and paid cash for them. Then we brought them up here. Now we are giving them back to Italy. We are giving back to Italy all the vessels we took from her, and we paid Venezuela and Brazil for those ships. Venezuela and Brazil gave the money that they got for the ships back to Italy. Now we are offering to pay Italy again for all the ships we sunk during the war, either in cash or by giving them ships of our own to make up the difference. If you do that, if your constituents want you to do that, all right, but wait until you get back home and you will find out whether some of them will not do a lot of kicking about what you are doing down here. If they kick to me that they want me to do that, they will have to send somebody else down here, because I am going to protect the American people, who do not want this thing of trying to destroy the American way of life, the American freedom we have enjoyed, and the American standard of living. It is about time we wake up, or else we will not have anything to wake up to. The first thing you know you will give everything you have away, and you will have nothing to think about but what the radicals of this country will do to you after you tear down the good, sound-thinking American people of this country.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman should know that what is actually involved here is property that belongs to Italian nationals which was taken over by the Alien Property Custodian and which we are now returning to them. This is the result of a side agreement entered into between Secretary Byrnes and the representatives of the Italian Government at the time they were negotiating the treaty between Italy and the United States and our Allies. Italy received such an unjust treaty that the least we can do now is to keep our word, our commitment that was made in the name of the people of the United States, and return to the Italians their own property.

Mr. RICH. Yes, we might have to agree to the commitments that are already made, but we have to get some men that are for America, we have to have some men pretty soon that will give consideration to the welfare of the United States. We have had too many people in official position in the last four or five years who want to hand everything over to some other country. We still have a lot of them. The quicker we get rid of them the better, and get some men in there that will look after the interest and the welfare of America before it is too late.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentleman from New York made the statement that Italy is the victim of an unjust treaty. I should like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask the gentleman from New York who is responsible for that unjust treaty with Italy.

Mr. RICH. Why does not the gentleman ask him? I will give him time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. While I ordinarily go along 100 percent with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, yet I think he will wish to correct his remarks when he undertakes to say that this country was dragged into this war.

Mr. RICH. We were dragged into it, when we had Pearl Harbor and they went over there and tried to destroy it. We got started in it there. But we had a President of the United States that said, "I promise you mothers again and again and again, I will keep you out of war." That same President did everything under the sun to get us into that war, and he did that before we had Pearl Harbor, too. The gentleman knows it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I may know that, which I deny, but—

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean to say that was not the case?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I absolutely do.

Mr. RICH. Then I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. It is my understanding in this proposed bill you are going to give the Italian Government 20 ships from the laid-up fleet after we provided in the ship sale bill to sell these ships to

American owners and foreign owners. We had a binding understanding that only that price would be taken for the ships and we assured American operators that no other ships would go on the seas in international trade other than at the price written in the ship sale bill. So if this passes we are breaking faith with these American operators who have come in and bought the ships as well as with the foreign operators because this is competition that they are not expecting. It is unfair competition besides so far as the ships sale bill is concerned which is the law of the land.

Mr. RICH. Then, if we enact this legislation, we are breaking faith with some of our American people. So that we find out we are getting so mixed up as time goes on that you get in a whirl and you do not know where you are going and you do not know what commitments have been made.

My time has expired and that is too bad, because we probably could discuss this for hours and I think it ought to be discussed for hours.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] who wants to know from me who is responsible for the unjust treaty that the Italian people received. I answer him very simply—the Big Four will have to share that responsibility. But that is neither here nor there. Italy is going through a terrible period of economic hardship. What we are doing here is not giving Italy any of our money at all. We are simply returning to the Italian nationals property that was taken over by the Enemy Alien Property Custodian. We are also giving Italy a few ships, replacing those ships which we took from Italy which have been destroyed or are now obsolete. We are replacing them with our Liberty ships. This bill carries out a commitment that Secretary Byrnes made to the representatives of the Italian Government at the time the treaty with Italy was being negotiated.

We are being asked here today to keep our word with the people of Italy, a word that was given by our then Secretary of State to Italy when he was dealing with the representatives of the Italian Government. The least we can do is to keep this promise to Italy after having broken so many that had been made to her.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this afternoon the Members of this House will vote to suspend the rules and pass the pending resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States. Adoption of this resolution before the close of this session is urged by the Department of State in the interest of strengthening our foreign policy. It merely carries out the commitments made in our behalf by Secretary of State Byrnes. Simple justice requires its immediate passage. As stated in the following telegram ad-

ressed to me by Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council, which I shall read, "It will have a tremendous helpful effect on the cause of democracy in Italy." The Senate has already recognized this and favorably considered Senate Joint Resolution 138. It merely authorizes the transfer or return to Italy by the United States of certain ships which have been in lay-up for a considerable time, and provides means for the return to the Italian Government and its nationals of those Italian properties now held by the Office of Alien Property. This legislation will strengthen the Italian economy and aid not only our national interest but the interest of world peace. It implements American foreign policy. I am sure that this vitally important resolution will receive your sympathetic consideration. I respectfully urge its immediate adoption.

The telegram I referred to reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 24, 1947.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building:

The Italian-American Labor Council urges you to use your influence and your vote in favor of the bill already approved by the Senate and defined as the "draft joint resolution to provide for return of Italian property in the United States and for other purposes." Our organization is confident that the above bill will be passed by the House of Representatives before its adjournment as it will have a tremendous helpful effect on the cause of democracy in Italy.

LUIGI ANTONINI, President.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple question: Are we going to live up to the commitment that we made in the treaty of peace with Italy? Are we going to stick to our word? It is true that we have bought these ships from Brazil and that they were seized from the Italian nationals—that is true. But I say to you gentlemen that when General Marshall, the Secretary of State, comes and says, "This is needed in order that peace and quiet may be restored on the face of the earth," I am going to stand by him, and I feel that every Member of the House, regardless of what my friend from Pennsylvania may say, agrees with me absolutely on that question.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I think this is good legislation and hope it will be enacted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in 3 minutes it will be difficult to emphasize, to the extent it should be, the importance of this legislation. I shall try, however, to do so by emphasizing, first, the thought which was just expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], and the same thought which was likewise expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

This whole question resolves itself into whether or not we are willing upon our part, as a nation, to make good the promises that were made by our American representatives in negotiating the Ital-

ian peace treaty. I think everyone is aware of the difficult situation that confronts our representatives in bringing that treaty to a conclusion. We were faced with situations that required them, as evidence of good faith upon our part, to promise to do the things that are provided for in this bill.

I am not going to peer into every nook and corner to see whether this or that or the other should have been done. I have confidence in the patriotism and Americanism of those who represented us in those crucial days. I believe they did everything humanly possible to bring into being a treaty that would be fair to all concerned. As far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for the passage of this bill, and, thereby uphold their hands and make good the promises they made in the name of our country.

I get tired of hearing individuals rise on this floor and remind Members that they have taken an oath of office. We are all aware of it. I am certain each of us is just as sincerely trying to carry out his and her oath and their obligation to our country as some of those who so frequently impress upon the House that they are trying to do so and leaving an inference that those who vote differently are not doing so. I am also of the opinion that if some of those who have criticized this bill as lacking in due regard for the rights of our nationals had spent as much time in studying it as they have in talking about it, I am certain they would have come to a different conclusion than they have with respect to it.

Do not think for a moment that our nationals have been overlooked. This bill takes care of our nationals. A sufficient amount of Italian property is retained or subject to lien to adequately protect and satisfy all possible claims.

In the second place most of these ships are no good to us nor of any use to us other than as scrap. Go down to the James River, go up to the Hudson, go to the other places where these ships have been pulled up and taken out of service, and you will see what I am saying is absolutely the truth. It is not taking money out of the pockets of our nationals. It is not taking money out of the pockets of Uncle Sam. But it is fulfilling an obligation that our American representatives made when the Italian treaty was negotiated. The promises our representatives made at that time helped greatly in achieving a treaty that gave some measure of help and security to the Italian Government in stabilizing its economic structure.

Senator VANDENBERG made a statement to the Senate when this bill was under consideration in that body. He explained the difficulties under which he and his colleagues labored in an effort to effect a peace treaty. It was absolutely necessary that a treaty be concluded at that time. It was a crucial situation they faced. The promise, which this bill embodies, undoubtedly was a determining factor in fixing the terms of peace set forth in the treaty. When Senator VANDENBERG had finished his statement, the Senate immediately passed the bill unanimously. I hope the House will do likewise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to gain 1 minute by unanimous consent to read a part of the regulations?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such a request. Under the rules, 20 minutes is allowed on each side.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the pending resolution a draft memorandum of understanding between Italy and the United States is in process of preparation for signature. Appended to that draft is annex I from which I quote as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF ITALY
REGARDING ITALIAN ASSETS IN THE UNITED
STATES AND CERTAIN CLAIMS OF UNITED
STATES NATIONALS

ANNEX I

The United States intends to effect returns, pursuant to article I, paragraph 1 (a) of this memorandum of understanding, by appropriate legislation permitting returns of vested property to Italy and subjects or citizens of Italy and corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy upon the terms and conditions generally applicable to return of such property to others eligible for return pursuant to section 32 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended.

It is understood that while the United States will seek to eliminate Italian nationality as a disqualification from eligibility for return pursuant to section 32 (a) of the Trading with the Enemy Act.

(a) The United States does not intend to assume any obligation to make returns to any of the following:

(1) the Italian Fascist Party, any organization closely affiliated therewith (other than the Italian Government) or any person who was a member of such party or organization at any time after September 8, 1943; or

(2) Any person, firm or organization convicted of violation of any of the statutes set forth in section 34 (a) of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended; or

(3) Any person, firm or organization convicted of war crimes or having collaborated with any enemy country after September 8, 1943; or

(4) Any person, firm or organization indicted or officially charged with war crimes or with having collaborated with an enemy country after September 8, 1943, until such person, firm or organization has been officially acquitted or cleared of such indictment or charge; or

(5) A corporation or association organized under the laws of any country other than Italy or Trieste; or

(6) Any individual who was at any time after December 7, 1941, a citizen or subject of a nation other than Italy with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war; or

(7) Any individual voluntarily resident at any time since December 7, 1941, within the territory of any nation other than Italy with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war;

(b) Ultimate disposition of property falling under the terms of section (a), paragraphs (1)-(7) above is reserved for future

decision by the Government of the United States, after consultation between the governments of Italy and the United States;

(c) The United States does not intend to make returns in any case in which it deems that return would be contrary to its interests in respect of national security or antitrust or fiscal policy; and

(d) The United States does not intend to assume any obligation to make returns of any property which was used pursuant to an arrangement to cloak or to conceal any property or interest within the United States of any person ineligible to receive a return under section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading with the Enemy Act.

It is further understood that in the case of any literary, artistic or industrial property to be returned, the property shall remain subject to all licenses and agreements for licenses which were granted or entered into by the United States with respect to it and which were in effect immediately prior to return; and any rights of the United States to revoke any such license or agreement for licenses shall not be included within the return.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call special attention to paragraph (a) (1) above and to the fact that on September 8, 1943, the Fascist Party of Italy was disbanded by decree. Hence there is little meaning to that language.

I believe it to be the intention of our committee, of which I have the honor of being the ranking majority member, that neither Nazis nor Fascists should obtain return of any of their property that had been vested in the United States by any agency of our Government. We are perfectly willing to have the vested property of non-Fascists returned to them, pursuant to this resolution.

It is therefore urged that this language I have referred to in annex I (a) (1) be revised to eliminate all possibility of return of vested assets to any Italian who participated in the affairs of the Fascist Party prior to September 8, 1943, as well as subsequently. It was the Fascist Party in control of the Italian Government that with the Nazis engulfed the world, including ourselves, in war and destruction. We are no more concerned with ex-Fascists of Italy than with the happily departed Duce himself.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation to implement the agreement of our Secretary of State with Italy. The treaty of peace with Italy was a hard treaty. This will soften the burden and help the Italian people who were our cobelligerents in the past war to get back on their feet. We are doing this by recognizing the rights we accorded them when we accepted the Italians as cobelligerents in the war against the Nazis.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution when it comes to a vote. I believe it falls within our foreign policy to aid in the reconstruction of postwar nonmonarchist Italy. It is in line with our insistence that those we help shall do all that is possible to help themselves. We will be furnishing

the Italian people with precious means for self-help if we pass this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 138.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT CONTROL ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1590) to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended, is amended by (1) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or," and (2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) The landlord, being a recognized school or an accredited nonprofit university, has a bona fide need for the premises for educational, research, administrative, or dormitory use."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks with respect to agricultural research in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORTS WITHOUT PRINTING IN RECORD

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the balance of the week to consider conference reports as they are submitted, notwithstanding the fact that they have not been printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the persistently gloomy world picture has so engrossed itself upon the American people

and the Congress that we sometimes overlook important steps of progress on the road to peace. Yet we are told that every cloud must have its silver lining, and recently I have observed two events which have given me great encouragement. One of these events received considerable publicity but the other, of equal importance in my opinion, has received little or no attention in the press.

The first item was the phenomenal reception to the first public offering of the securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development last week. The World Bank is designed as a long-term lending agency for rebuilding factories, harbors, railroads, and the like destroyed during the war. On the basis of resources and guaranties of all member countries, its founders hoped from the beginning to tap various sources of investment and to give reconstruction and development credits to governments and government-sponsored borrowers. But not until last week was it known how great or how small might be the confidence of private investors in this new adjunct of the United Nations. According to the New York Times of July 17, 1947, the bank recently announced that it was preparing two issues of its securities aggregating \$250,000,000. These issues were cleared by the Security and Exchange Commission at 3:30 Monday afternoon, July 14. Subscription books were opened at the beginning of business on Tuesday, July 15, and by noon officials of the bank announced that the offering had been heavily oversubscribed. This display of confidence in the world bank must have been gratifying to former Assistant Secretary of War, John J. McCloy, now president of the bank, and to his staff. I am sure that all Americans who are interested in the maintenance of a sound and healthy economy of private capitalism view with satisfaction the coordination of effort in financing the capital needs of devastated sections of the world. As the New York Times editorial observed:

No such emphatic demonstration as this could have taken place in the absence of public confidence in the bank and what it essentially symbolizes—the determination and ability of the world ultimately to work its way back to vigorous economic and political health.

Of perhaps equal importance, Mr. Speaker, was the decision last week of the Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means not to issue a contemplated critical report of the reciprocal trade program of the United States, and the efforts of the United States and 17 other countries at Geneva to lay the foundation for an International Trade Organization. The reciprocal trade policies, formulated by the Congress under the sound guidance of that eminent statesman, Hon. Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, is the best antidote to the poisonous economic warfare that already looms on the continent of Europe. The International Trade Organization is an effort on a broad scale to deal with the problem of reducing public and private barriers to trade and of eliminating trade discriminations.

Some questions have been raised about the relationship, if any, between

the ITO and the Marshall plan for economic rehabilitation of Europe. In a press conference on July 2, 1947, Under Secretary of State, William L. Clayton, made a very simple explanation of the interdependence of these two proposals. Mr. Clayton said:

The object of General Marshall's suggestions is the prompt rehabilitation of the European economy, through Europe's joint efforts, assisted by the United States.

The object of ITO is to bring about agreement among nations covering their international economic relationships, in order to assist them to maintain a stable economy once it has been rehabilitated.

The Marshall plan makes the ITO negotiations more important than ever because without a sound permanent program of reciprocal multilateral trade, no temporary emergency program could possibly have any permanent worth-while result.

As I view the problem, the Marshall plan involves the cooperation of the United States with the 16 countries now meeting at Paris in determining the capital needs for the reconstruction of the European economy and the available resources for such capital. These capital requirements may be provided jointly by the World Bank, appropriations by the United States Congress, and sources within the stricken countries. The Marshall plan will provide the machinery and the engines to get the factories, mines, and railroads of industrial Europe humming once again. But to revive the productive capacity of these European nations will be of little avail if, in self-defense, each nation feels compelled to maintain quotas and exchange restrictions which preclude the flow of world commerce.

In many respects our planning for the long-range development of world trade and the abolition of artificial barriers to commerce has received greater immediate attention than the pressing problem of starting the wheels of industry.

In his Harvard speech, Secretary Marshall emphasized how grave is the danger of a complete break-down in the modern system of the division of labor upon which the exchange of products is based. He pointed out that in vast areas in Europe town and city industries are not producing adequate goods to exchange with the food-producing farmer. Since the farmer cannot find the goods for sale which he desires to purchase, he feeds more grain to stock and provides his family with a more ample supply of food, although he may have insufficient clothing and other necessities of civilization.

The Paris Conference is the answer to General Marshall's suggestion that the European countries draft a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. There has been some suggestion that the venture is too costly for the United States to undertake. It has been said that our resources are inadequate for the task, but just as we could neither avert nor win World War II by thinking about its cost, neither can we avoid the responsibility nor the adverse efforts to our own country and our own way of living by placing a dollar and cents limitation upon the economic recovery of western European civilization.

So the Marshall plan and the ITO are integral parts of the over-all plan for the restoration of world economic sta-

bility. The capital advanced by the United States or by the World Bank cannot be repaid unless an agency like the ITO establishes rules for international trade. We sometimes lose sight of the importance to freedom of enterprise in this country in having a pattern of international trade in which the major decisions are reached by private buyers and sellers in active competition, rather than by governments. Those who fear the power which may be vested in the proposed International Trade Organization should not fail to consider the alternative of quotas, exchange restrictions, and domination of trade through international monopolies and cartels.

One of the outstanding achievements of the current session of the Congress has been the bipartisan support of our foreign economic policy, as well as of our foreign policy in general.

Prior to the departure of Under Secretary of State Clayton for Geneva for the reciprocal trade and ITO negotiations, the President issued an Executive order establishing certain definite trade-agreements procedures. One of these provisions requires the inclusion of an escape clause in all trade agreements hereafter negotiated. The President's order was the result of conversations between Under Secretaries of State Acheson and Clayton and Members of another body. In his statement announcing the issuance of his Executive order, the President said that these Members agreed that we should go forward with the Geneva negotiations. Nevertheless, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means called extensive hearings to investigate the operation of the reciprocal trade program, including the proposed International Trade Organization. When the hearings ended after several weeks it was considered not unlikely that the majority would prepare a public report which might prove embarrassing to the leadership of the United States at Geneva. The decision of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means not to issue such a report, as I said at the beginning, has received little consideration by the press. I have taken this opportunity, therefore, to express my congratulations for this demonstration on the part of the House of the same fine bipartisan support of our foreign economic policy that had already been demonstrated on the part of the leadership of the Senate.

The reciprocal trade program has the overwhelming support of the American people. Public-opinion polls show that from 75 to 80 percent of the public favor the extension of this important pillar of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point an article from Modern Industry of April 15, 1947, and another item from Modern Industry of June 15, 1947, which magazine conducted the most recent public poll on this question.

[From Modern Industry of April 15, 1947]

SHOULD THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM BE CONTINUED?

"YES," SAYS C. A. RICHARDS, DIRECTOR, EXPORT DIVISION, INTERCHEMICAL CORP., NEW YORK

(In the export business for over 50 years, Richards is president of the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, and served as

consultant to United States Government during the war.)

Because—

1. Our exports to countries with whom we have reciprocal agreements rose 63 percent as against 32 percent to others. Imports from countries with agreements rose 22 percent, compared with 12½ percent from others.

2. So far no American industry has suffered under the agreements—escape clauses are rarely invoked.

3. We can compete successfully with foreign products, despite our higher labor costs, because of our greater manufacturing know-how.

4. The real deterrent to foreign trade is quota systems, not tariffs.

I am not a free trader, but am for freedom of trade. I believe that the reciprocal trade program should be continued because of what it has already done to help our export trade, which is my first interest.

The necessity for the program initiated by Secretary of State Hull in 1933 was largely caused by the passage in 1930 of the Hawley-Smoot tariff. It raised many rates of duty to a point where our importation of certain commodities became very difficult, if not impossible.

In retaliation, many countries immediately raised tariff, exchange, and other barriers against imports from this country.

The first reciprocal trade agreement law empowered the President to reduce these 1930 tariff rates by a maximum of 50 percent. The Doughton bill, passed in 1945, gave the President the power to reduce the rates in effect on January 1, 1945, by 50 percent. Since passage of the Doughton bill, no tariffs have been reduced, although there are some reductions contemplated at the meetings of the 18 nations to be held in Geneva this month.

No United States industry of any size has been seriously interfered with by reductions made in the 1930 rates to date. We should view this whole program, not from the viewpoint of what harm it could do, but what harm it has done and what benefits have accrued from it. I have asked men in a position to know, who have been opposed to its continuance, what important industries have been harmed, and have been unable to find any.

Furthermore, since the first agreement was made there have been some complaints made to the Government regarding concessions, and these have been divided into two groups: one, unimportant complaints frequently arising from misunderstandings of the agreements; and the second, those that might be termed formal complaints.

As a result, supplementary agreements have been concluded with Canada and Switzerland. The concession granted on handkerchiefs in the trade agreement with Switzerland was ended, and an informal agreement was reached to restrict the importation of watches and parts. In January of this year the State Department announced a proposed termination of the concession on linen fire hose, granted in the trade agreement with Canada.

Program is flexible

These facts have been provided by the Committee for Reciprocity Information. They fairly conclusively show that, to date, operation of the reciprocal trade program has proved that, where necessary to the protection of our own industry, conditions can be altered.

Furthermore, in the trade agreement signed with Mexico on December 23, 1942, there is an escape clause. In the recent Executive order of the President, it is officially stated that a clause to the same effect will be incorporated in all future trade agreements. Since the signing of the agreement with Mexico over 4 years ago, no complaints

have been filed with the committee under this clause.

Few changes to date

Space is lacking to recite the many changes which the Government might have made in our tariff structure but did not. Yet one or two might be cited to emphasize the care with which the program has been handled to date:

Take the case of yarn spun of rayon. In the Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph 1303, this duty is stipulated at 12½ cents a pound, plus an ad valorem duty of 45 percent and 50 percent, depending on whether singles or plied. Despite the power given the President over all these years, this rate has not been changed. If the Doughton bill's provisions are used, the most it can be reduced is to 6¼ cents a pound, plus 22½ percent and 25 percent, respectively.

Don't overlook the fact that the power, under the Doughton bill, to reduce tariffs by 50 percent is not from the original 1930 rate, but from the January 1, 1945, rate.

Therefore, if the tariff has not been reduced on any article, the most the President can do is to reduce it 50 percent from the 1930 rate. If it has already been reduced the full 50 percent permitted by the original bill, that rate may be reduced another 50 percent, which will make the total reduction 75 percent.

Another instance: Paragraph 1108 in the 1930 tariff covers woven woollens weighing not more than 4 ounces a square yard. Under the 1930 tariff the rate was 50 cents a pound, plus 50 percent ad valorem, 55 percent ad valorem, and 60 percent ad valorem, depending upon the value of the fabric. The President has not changed the specific duty, but he has reduced the ad valorem to a flat 37½ percent.

Nub—it fosters trade

On the other hand, the fact should be emphasized, as was set forth in Mr. Clayton's letter of January 16 to Senator HUGH BUTLER, that between 1934-35 and 1938-39 our exports to countries with which we had trade agreements increased 63 percent, as against 32 percent with countries with whom we did not have trade agreements. In the same period our imports from those with whom we had trade agreements increased 22 percent, against 12½ percent from the others.

No fact brings out more emphatically the advantages which have accrued to us from this reciprocal trade program.

Another often-quoted argument against this program is the contention that if we lower tariffs, we necessarily must lower our own standards of living. I cannot find any proof of this alleged effect. Standards of living in this country are the highest in the world. And yet, for over 50 years I have been in the export business and seen exports grow. Why?

Because we lead the world in producing certain articles better and cheaper than they could be produced by the countries from which we import them.

United States is more efficient

For example, the production per man of coal in England is less than 2 tons a day. In this country it is about 50 tons a day. Surely, with this increased production we can afford to pay our miners higher wages than the miners in England receive.

In 1938, the last prewar year, we imported about \$28,000,000 worth of cotton manufactures and semimanufactures, on which a duty averaging 44.9 percent, equivalent to \$12,586,000, was imposed.

In 1944 the British Government sent a mission here headed by Sir Frank Platt, British cotton controller. This mission investigated our entire textile industry. On its return a report was made from which I should like to quote one sentence:

"British P. M. H. [production per man per hour] (calculated on the basis of total output and total labor force) is less than the American by about 18 to 49 percent in spinning, by 80 to 85 percent in winding, by 70 to 89 percent in beaming, and by 56 to 67 percent in weaving."

Revise, but keep the law

It is my hope that when the program comes up again in 1948 that the Congress will extend the existing law, making any administrative changes which may seem desirable beyond those covered by the President's recent Executive order, so long as they do not make the program unworkable.

I have never found any opponent who had facts to justify opposition to the continuance of the program. But they had fear—fear that the power given the executive branch of the Government might harm some United States industry. This fear has no justification based on the facts known to date.

Tariff isn't the only bar

One other very important point is too frequently overlooked in considering this program: That a serious deterrent to international trade today lies, not only in the amount of the tariff collected by any country, including ourselves, on the importation of the product, but in some of the semi-visible handicaps to freedom of international trade which have been cropping up during the war and since VJ-day.

For example, there is the recent Argentine announcement of three exchange rates—which is in effect an increase in tariff on certain items of 13 percent and on other items of 32 percent. There is also the quota system used by some countries, which is far more injurious to international trade than the tariff. Quotas set the maximum of a commodity that may be imported from a country, whereas the commodity may be free or dutiable. Under a tariff, even though high, persons may import if they wish to pay the price. But under the quota system imports are definitely limited.

The quota system is not new but it is growing; and it is one of the evils which our representatives at Geneva intend to bring into the open and endeavor to eliminate to the maximum extent.

Repeatedly it has been said that even in this country our tariff is not as big a deterrent to imports as the Treasury Department decisions, made under the tariff. Active steps are now being taken to put our own house in order.

NO. SAYS HAROLD J. WALTER, PRESIDENT, UXBRIDGE WORSTED CO., INC., UXBRIDGE, MASS.

Because—

1. Lower tariffs would harm many United States industries and kill, among others, the textile industry which can't compete against foreign labor.

2. Our national defense would be jeopardized if we face another crisis with a weakened textile industry to supply our armed forces.

3. Mass unemployment here would wreak havoc on the world economy, whereas several million unemployed in such low-pay countries as France, England, Germany, India, China, etc., would have little effect on the world.

4. America can help the world only if her industries remain prosperous.

Lowering tariffs, we are told, promises a panacea for all of the world's ills; for bringing prosperity to impoverished countries, for creating good will and understanding between this country and others; for leading the way toward continuing world peace; for increasing the already astronomical United States income of \$175,000,000,000 yearly.

Can tariff be all these things—do all these things? Are not several of these arguments irreconcilable?

Before a decision, we must decide first what a tariff is, not only by definition but also in terms of what it means to workers, to the manufacturer of textiles, the manufacturer of automobiles or typewriters or razor blades, to the politician, and to the Department of State.

A tariff is a tax placed on foreign goods at entry into this country. This tax is designed for two purposes: (1) To provide revenue for the Government; and (2) to protect American manufacturers from a flood of foreign goods which, cheaply produced in countries with lower living standards than ours, can undersell our products in domestic markets.

What does the average worker know about tariffs? Not much.

If he thinks at all about tariffs, he thinks of them in terms of his favorite radio commentator or the particular slant which his newspaper gives him. For the most part, however, the worker has little or no idea what a tariff is, what it is designed to do, or what the present arguments for further reductions under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are about. He knows little or nothing of how tariffs affect his job, his industry.

Using the same definition, how does the American textile manufacturer feel about the tariff?

He feels that the tariff has been a bulwark against foreign rivals which could have in the past, and will in the future if further reductions are made, put him out of business.

His reasons are simple and easily understood:

Labor is the dominant cost factor in textile manufacturing. There are still few, if any, true mechanical operations or manpower short cuts. Expanding operations or larger volume does not decrease unit labor cost as in many industries.

Labor costs in textiles now rank with some of the highest. The figures show a rise of 112 percent in 6 years. Yet even before these advances, textile labor costs were several times greater in the United States than in England, many times greater than those in Japan. Now, the disparity is even wider.

The average rate for textile work in the United States is now \$1.20 an hour. In England, it is 35 cents an hour. On the Continent and in India and Japan, it is considerably less than the English figure. Even allowing for the greater efficiencies of American labor and machinery, it is impossible to overcome this wide separation.

Leaders of the textile industry believe the present tariff must be maintained if there is to be a textile industry in the United States.

Do the manufacturers of automobiles, or typewriters, or razor blades see the same things when they look at the tariff? No.

These industries, and others, have become highly mechanical. Labor costs per unit have come down and down through the use of automatic machinery. They do not have to worry about cheap foreign labor because labor to them represents such a low cost on a unit basis.

In addition, United States technical advances have far outstripped those in most foreign countries. As a result, labor costs are about the same, despite the higher wages in this country, because more actual labor must be used abroad to produce the same article.

Whose ox is gored?

Tariffs are not needed to protect these industries. And since they have no fear that other countries will undersell them in the United States, they are in favor of reducing or removing tariffs on all goods, for instance, on textiles. A flood of textiles would build foreign exchange in this country for the purchase of machine goods. Textile production in England and France is rapidly recovering from the war and offers an immediate opportunity for exports.

Naturally United States machine industries oppose tariffs as hindrances to their expanding export business.

XCIII—647

The politician, in far too many instances, views the tariff issue in terms of sectional advantage. Frequently it becomes a bargaining issue: "I'll vote for your tariff if you vote for my pork barrel."

The Department of State follows closely the line of the highly mechanized industries. Tariffs become barriers to expanding world trade. Reduction of tariffs, they say, enhances our position as the leading nation of the world.

Fact outweighs prejudice

Tariffs, the State Department and others would have us believe, only protect production inefficiencies. This is not a valid argument in the textile industry for a very simple reason, a reason which has been overlooked completely by proponents of tariff reduction because of ignorance, prejudice, or both.

Textiles, except where man-made fibers, such as rayon, nylon, are concerned, involve the processing of wool and cotton. No one has been able to raise sheep so that the hair on each is the same weight, length, and strength as that on the sheep next to it. Cotton, too, varies greatly from field to field, from season to season, and boll to boll.

Textiles deal with a product which is as variable as New England weather. It cannot be controlled as it is possible to manipulate the texture, hardness, or particular quality wanted in steel.

Textile plants are efficient

The charge of inefficiency cannot stand when knowledge is brought into the picture. Here then, are the questions:

Is the textile manufacturer wrong to fight for his survival?

Is the automobile manufacturer right to fight to enlarge his industry, his export trade, at the expense of textiles?

Is the politician right in expressing himself in terms of prosperity for his own constituency, the rest of the country be damned?

Is the Department of State right in concerning itself with the unemployed of the world when the death of the textile and other industries is at stake with the consequent unemployment or displacement of millions of our own workers?

What are the answers?

Loss: \$24,000,000,000

Ten million unemployed workers at \$1.20 an hour in the United States means a reduction in the national income of \$24,000,000,000. This does not take into consideration the additional losses because of decreased buying power, or lost taxes. These same 10,000,000 unemployed in England at 35 cents an hour reduce that country's income by only \$7,000,000,000. In Japan, India, or China, the loss in income would be a mere two to three billion dollars or less.

Would it not mean more to the United States, and to the world, to keep those 10,000,000 people working right here than it would be to have 10,000,000 persons employed somewhere else in the world?

Two million unemployed in England, four million in France, Germany, and Poland, and four more million in India, China, and Japan, would have little effect on world economy.

But in the United States, 10,000,000 unemployed could spell depression and economic chaos in the world. Certainly these countries might have more foreign exchange to purchase goods here, but there is no assurance it would be all spent here; and even if it were, it would be but a drop in the bucket as compared to the \$24,000,000,000 lost.

Would you care to decree the death of the seventh largest employer of labor in the United States, the textile industry, holding out only the wild-eyed promise that ultimately those thousands of persons now employed in that industry—who would be unemployed by its demise—would be absorbed into the remaining plants?

Would crush small towns

It is a great industry made up of small units. Many of these are responsible for the welfare of the villages in which they are situated. All together, they form a vital part of our national economy.

The textile industry depends on the tariff for its very life, and will continue to do so until technical advances reduce unit labor costs to compete with cheap foreign labor.

I use the textile industry as an example, because it is the one with which I am familiar. But many more industries ride in our boat. They need tariff protection, too.

Under present conditions, with tariffs at their present levels, England can ship cloth into our domestic markets and undersell American manufacturers. What good can accrue from a further lowering of the tariff?

Shield in time of war

Imagine the United States facing another crisis as it did in 1941 with a weak or negligible textile industry dependent on foreign sources for the uses of textiles in wartime.

The retention of strong armed forces is urged and draws little disagreement from informed sources. Yet many would nullify the effectiveness of those forces by weakening one of the principal sources of its supply.

America can help the world only if America can remain prosperous. Weakening certain industries to expand others is certainly not the way to keep America prosperous.

[From Modern Industry of July 15, 1947]

LANDSLIDE VOTE FOR RECIPROCAL TRADE

By a thumping majority of 81 to 19 percent, readers of Modern Industry from coast to coast voted "Yes" to the April 15 Debate in Print: Should the reciprocal trade-agreements program be continued?

C. A. Richards, director, export division, Interchemical Corp., New York, upheld the affirmative in that debate. He argued that no United States industry has suffered under the agreements; and that we can compete with foreign products, despite our higher labor costs, because of our greater manufacturing know-how.

Harold J. Walter, president, Uxbridge Worsted Co., Inc., Uxbridge, Mass., for the negative, maintained that lower tariffs would cripple many United States industries and kill the textile industry. We can help the world only if our industries remain sound.

Typical comments from voters agreeing with the "yes" side:

"By exporting, our manufacturers can maintain high production. But we cannot export unless we import in proportion."
* * * "Extension of world trade is best assurance of peace."

"No" side: "Reciprocity in these agreements benefits other countries only."
* * * "We have too high a standard of living to trade with other countries under a low tariff."

The area-by-area vote:

	"Yes" percent
New England.....	69.6
Mid-Atlantic.....	84.5
North Central.....	85.5
South.....	75.0
Midwest.....	75.4
Mountain and Pacific coast.....	78.8
	"No" percent
New England.....	30.4
Mid-Atlantic.....	15.5
North Central.....	14.5
South.....	25.0
Midwest.....	24.6
Mountain and Pacific coast.....	21.2

Congressmen and key Washington officials have already received these results.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous importance of the reciprocal trade

program to the establishment of an international trade organization and the ultimate success of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe, not to mention the overwhelming support manifested by the American public, I trust that the Committee on Ways and Means will early in the next session report out a bill providing for the extension of the reciprocal trade authority of the President without restrictive amendments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by Mr. Lyons in the Polish Review of July 10, 1947.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, insist on the amendment of the House and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VORYS, JUDD, FULTON, MANSFIELD, and ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question.

The SPEAKER. The time for the reservation of objections is past. The Chair had put the request, and it was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question with reference to the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICH. Then I ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to go along in the regular way. I object to the consent request coming at this time.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 246, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

Mr. SADLAK. As an outstanding branch of agriculture and figuring prominently in our everyday life the poultry industry proudly points to 100 years of service.

The oldest poultry show in the world got its start in Boston, Mass., and January 20 to 24, 1948, inclusive, is set aside for the Boston Poultry Show, marking a century of poultry progress. This exposition will cover every branch of the industry including breeding, processing, marketing of poultry, and great exhibits of live birds from every State in the Union. The entire Mechanics Building, covering a solid city block, has been engaged for the event. I understand that national organizations connected with the poultry industry have already scheduled their official annual meetings to coincide with this occasion.

And so we are approaching the centennial of the first organized effort in behalf of the poultry business which has developed to such a degree that it ranks second only, in money value, to the dairy industry.

A most interesting comment on this resolution appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Thursday morning, July 24, 1947, written by the Associated Press from Washington, as follows:

PROPOSED STAMP WOULD GIVE CHICKENS MUCH TO CACKLE ABOUT

WASHINGTON, JULY 23.—The 1,000,000,000 chickens in the country soon may have something they really can cackle and crow about.

For Representative SADLAK, Republican, of Connecticut, has just introduced into Congress a resolution calling for a special stamp in the chickens' honor.

SADLAK did this at the request of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow magazine, published at New Haven, Conn. Ives naturally is quite excited because exactly 100 years ago this Nation had its first poultry show.

Want to talk about progress? Want to talk about tremendous achievements? Well, then, talk about chickens.

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

"Like many other immigrants," says the Department of Agriculture in a tribute to its feathered friends, "the modern chicken has found the United States a land of opportunity."

And indeed it has. Few chickens ever think much about it now, but their ancestors came from the jungles—from New Guinea, Java, and Malaya.

They were taken to Europe, and from there to the American colonies.

SOME FEATHERY FACTS

And now for some feathery facts:

Farmers get \$3,000,000,000 from their chicken crop each year.

Like a mattress tester, a hen can get ahead by laying down on the job. But she once figured that 86 eggs were a year's work. The average now has been boosted to 113, and in good flocks smart clucks do twice that well.

A gizzard has nothing to do with a chicken's digestion. A rooster had one removed, felt fine, lived four more years.

An eating chicken soon may be built to specifications. A national grocery company decided it wanted an ideal chicken, and offered a reward for same.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration

of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

In the opinion of the committee, wherein there was unanimous approval, this industry, which has made such rapid progress and which constitutes such an important segment of our economic life, merits this recognition.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in favor of House Joint Resolution 246, submitted by my colleague, ANTONI N. SADLAK, calling for the issuance of a special stamp by the Post Office Department in commemoration of the one hundredth birthday anniversary of the poultry business in the United States. A hundred years ago the oldest poultry show in the world started in Boston and there the interest in poultry was born which has grown throughout the years and developed this gigantic industry. It produced nearly \$3,000,000,000 during 1946 in the United States. Among all farm interests it is exceeded only by the great dairy interest. In Connecticut it heads the list of all industries by a wide margin. As an old poultryman myself, and a life long friend of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow, one of the leading poultry papers in the United States, who is also chairman of the show committee for the one hundredth Boston poultry show, I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

The joint resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee I call up House Resolution 315, providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommitt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of S. 1498, which is a bill to support the price of wool until December 31, 1948.

This is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any extended explanation of this bill is necessary. We have had wool legislation before us previously this year. A similar bill passed the House on May 23. It was vetoed by the President on June 26. On the same day the Senate passed this bill before us today.

The first bill contained a provision which was objectionable to the President. I think the President should have signed the first bill. However, if we are going to continue the price-support program for wool we must pass this bill. I do not like it as well as the first bill, but we have no alternative.

The purpose of this bill is to direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue the wool price-support program that expired on April 15, 1947. Since that date the Government has not supported the price of wool. I understand some of the finer grades of wool have been selling at good prices and there has been a ready market for the same. However, the cheaper grades of wool have not been moving and there will be no market for these types of wool until this legislation is passed.

The bill also provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell the wool purchased in previous years and now on hand. It is estimated there are about 460,000,000 pounds of this wool. Up to now this wool could not be sold in competition with foreign wool for the reason that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not permitted to sell below the parity price. Since this price was above the prices quoted on foreign wool there was no opportunity to dispose of the same. This bill removes all restrictions, and this wool can now be sold.

If the bill previously passed by the Congress had become a law this wool could have been sold without any loss to the Government. That bill provided for quotas and import fees on foreign wool in the discretion of the President. In that manner we could have sold this large stock pile of wool and sustained no loss. This bill contains no such provision. I hope we can dispose of this wool with little loss, but we could have avoided any loss whatever if the President had signed the bill passed by this House 2 months ago.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I take this opportunity to go on record at this point as being utterly opposed to this legislation or legislation of a similar character.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I say to my good friend from New Jersey that the time is here when we must pay a little more attention to some of our domestic industries in this country. Otherwise, we will become entirely dependent upon foreign nations for our supply of strategic raw materials, whether it be wool or some other commodity. Surely we learned the value of domestic industries during the war when foreign imports of many items were stopped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey that if the wool industry does not get this help he might as well kiss the American wool industry good-by.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. It has passed the Senate and I hope it will be passed by the House without amendment so that it can be sent direct to the White House. I urge the adoption of the rule and the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, after the rule is adopted there will be general debate, but no vote will be taken on the bill this evening. I am not going to deviate from my policy of not opposing a rule on a bill that has been reported after consideration by a legislative committee. I feel, however, this is another bill which will add additional costs and burdens upon the American consumer and the American people.

I fully appreciate the position of the wool growers in the West. In fact, as I have often said before, I am deeply interested in their welfare. So, of course, are the manipulators who make fortunes by manipulating the wool supplies, and who are interested in this bill because it calls for Government support of wool prices—in fact, it has been estimated that this bill will tax the American people from \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000 annually for the benefit of those who buy and sell wool, though it will do little enough for the herders and the shearers and the workers.

ANOTHER SUBSIDY

It is another disguised subsidy to the wool growers to guarantee them continued high profits and benefits. It is an unending source of amazement to me to see how these industrialists and their highly paid lobbies can get anything they want from this Republican Congress, always at the expense of the consumers, the workers, and the taxpayers. Since the infamous political coalition of the Seventy-ninth Congress was formed, and now with an overwhelming Republican majority in both Houses of Congress, there is not even any effective opposition or criticism of this lobbyists' steam roller.

The only redeeming feature of this bill, as I view it, is that it will permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any or all of the 460,000,000 pounds of wool owned now by the Government, which may help to clothe the world, and which the British wool combine through various tricks and artifices has been able to tie up, notwithstanding that we produce only about one-third of the wool we use each year.

THE WAR IS OVER NOW

This was done with the knowing connivance of American manufacturers and traders, and again shows how selfish our own industrialists and merchants can be, and how they retard the progress of our country and go against the welfare and interest of the consumers by maintain-

ing outrageously high prices without any justification.

I concede that during the war Congress passed a wool subsidy act to insure the production of a sufficient quantity of wool to meet our domestic and military needs and even provided that prices should be frozen for 2 years after the war.

But the war is over and has been for 2 years. We have kept faith with the wool producers. They and the manufacturers have been the beneficiaries of the Government bounty to the disadvantage of the people.

What I say about wool applies equally to all other commodities. I wonder how long the American people will continue to be bled.

I fully appreciate that many of the Members who favor this legislation are my personal friends, for whom I have a high regard; but when we are acting on legislation which affects all the people we should not permit personal friendships to affect or corrupt our judgments. We must take into consideration the needs and wishes of the people.

The President vetoed the first wool bill because of its bad effect on the economy; but so far as I am concerned I cannot see that this bill offers any improvement in its protection to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the iniquitous loyalty bill was rigged for passage by the superpatriots and witch hunters of the House who are not satisfied with the thoroughness of the regulations promulgated by Executive order to root out disloyal Communists and parlor pinks, I shuddered at the thought of the humiliation of the countless thousands of faithful and devoted Government employees, loyal to their job and more so to their beloved country, who will be forced to go through third-degree examinations in order to retain their jobs. The distinguished, able, and trustworthy columnist, Lowell Mellett, known for fairness, liberality, and searching scrutiny, treats the recent and unwarranted action of the House so comprehensively and honestly that I felt I could do no better than to avail myself of his eloquence by reading into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his comments published in the Washington Star of Tuesday, July 22. His opinion and expressions coincide with my views and sentiments.

ON THE OTHER HAND—CONGRESS MAY DO THE UNFORGIVABLE IN SEEKING TO ENFORCE LOYALTY BY LAW

(By Lowell Mellett)

In an attempt to do the impossible, Congress may do the unforgivable. The House already has done its worst—but lack of time is likely to prevent the Senate from following suit immediately.

The House seeks to enforce loyalty by law. The Members who voted to do this will tell

you this is not quite true, that all they seek to do is to make sure that no disloyal persons shall have employment in the Government.

To this end all persons about to be employed, as well as the hundreds of thousands already employed, would be given searching examinations as to their loyalty. The business would start with the Civil Service Commission looking over its own files and fingerprints and then proceeding to the records of the FBI, the Army and Navy, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, local law enforcement agencies and any other sources that might occur to anybody.

If somewhere along the line something "derogatory" should be turned up—such as somebody making serious but unsupported charges against the man or woman under consideration—the name would be certified to the FBI for a full-fledged investigation. The result of this investigation would be presented to a Federal Loyalty Board, created by the act. This board would decide whether the employee or candidate for a job was loyal. If not found loyal, he would be fired or not hired.

DEFENSE HOBBOLED

The Board would make its decision on evidence—but the accused person would not see or hear the evidence. He could have counsel, but the counsel could not confront his accusers, subpoena witnesses or cross-examine any witness.

The man or woman found guilty of "disloyalty" through this utterly unfair and un-American process would be branded for life. He would find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain other employment. The man or woman found "loyal" would, in many instances, be in no better situation. The very fact that he or she had been subjected to suspicion and dragged through such proceedings would leave its stigma, a smear that would stick.

That is the unforgivable thing the House is willing to do. And, as said, it is also attempting the impossible.

Loyalty is a state of mind and heart. It is a matter of the spirit. The same is true of disloyalty. Overt disloyalty or treason is a crime and punishable as such. Like every other country, we have plenty of law for that. But only the Japanese, in the heyday of their military men, could conceive of "thought police" as a means of reaching the impure mind. Only the Japanese—until the present strange hysteria hit the House.

It is to be hoped that this hysteria will subside before Congress comes back in January. If it doesn't get better, it may get worse. We may find Federal employees compelled to take new and fearsome oaths, written in their own blood, as a requisite for serving Uncle Sam.

TO HARM INNOCENT

Yet, loyalty will remain a matter of spirit, with no man able to say who does and who does not possess it. You may feel that any man who volunteered in the last war and offered his life in defense of his country had loyalty beyond questioning. But it won't be beyond questioning if he applies for a Government job.

You may have other odd ideas about loyalty. You may think the Members of the House owe a certain amount of loyalty to these same veterans—owe them some loyal assistance or protection in the matter of housing, for example. Many Members, however, including some who voted for this loyalty bill, have a different notion on that subject. Their loyalty has gone instead to the real estate interests.

Loyalty is, indeed, a thing difficult to get at. The House is attempting to get at it in the worst possible way. And, in the process, it is certain to do grievous harm to many innocent persons.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, there are several things that have happened since this matter was debated by the House some months ago. In the first place the previous bill that passed the House was vetoed by the President. In the second place, the market for wool and particularly fine wool, has strengthened very materially, so that the sales of the finer wools in this country that have been made during the period of the past few months have averaged in price from 5 to 9 cents above the support price provided for in this bill. The poorer grade wool, however, is not moving effectively, largely for the reason that the mills have not known whether or not under some such legislation as this the Commodity Credit Corporation will be disposing of its surplus stocks of inferior grade wools at a price which would very much affect the general market.

I realize that the hour is very late, and I am only taking this very brief time now to put into the RECORD an amendment which I shall offer to this bill when it comes up for amendment, which I understand will not be tonight but tomorrow. That amendment is a very simple one. Instead of fixing the support price at a definite figure which could not change regardless of what happens to other commodities or to our economy in general, I am going to move that the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" be stricken out and that in lieu thereof there be substituted "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not the same language that the gentleman offered when the original wool bill was before the House?

Mr. HERTER. No; it is not the same amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the difference?

Mr. HERTER. The amendment I offered before was at 90 percent of parity. It could not have been fixed higher than that. I am offering tomorrow "at not less than 90 percent of parity" so that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation can fix it at a higher price if they see fit. That is the formula that has been applied to agricultural products. The gentleman's own Committee on Agriculture reported a bill this week dealing with milk prices in which exactly the same formula applies, and it still allows the Commodity Credit Corporation to fix the price higher than 90 percent of parity if it thinks such a price is justified. It is like the Steagall amendment. It is exactly like every other commodity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that back on March 11, 1946, President Truman addressed a letter to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY in regard to the wool situation, and I would like to read that letter, if I may:

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: On January 5, 1946, you sent me a memorandum on wool in accordance with a suggestion I had made to you at a conference on the subject. In your memorandum you suggested that I request the interested agencies of the Government to confer and to prepare a wool program. Such a program has now been prepared and is attached. It represents the considered views of the administration on the best methods for solving a serious and difficult problem.

Your committee will, of course, be able to call on the interested agencies for any desired assistance in your further studies of the wool situation or in drafting appropriate legislation.

I trust that the Congress will find that this proposed wool program constitutes a sound and adequate basis for constructive legislation.

In closing I wish to express my agreement with you that cooperation between the Executive and the Congress is essential to the establishment of an effective wool program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

In the attached statement the administration and the agencies' interest recognize the fact that parity on wool is not fair and this is the language pertinent to parity as it affects wool.

1. The parity price of wool be revised or established at the so-called comparable level so that wool parity prices will be on a level equivalent to parity prices for other farm products.

In other words, for some reason the administration and the agencies affected consider 90 percent of parity for wool producers as inadequate protection to the wool growers of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, if we had adopted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we would never have had this controversy at all. What the gentleman says is the meat of the whole controversy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is mighty poor legislation. It is nothing but a subsidy bill. It also puts the Government into business to buy all the wool in the country from now on until December 31, 1948. It pays the highest price for wool that we paid in 27 years, and guarantees it with money we will have to take out of the Treasury. We now have 400,000,000 pounds of wool in the stock pile, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is supposed to sell it.

They have to sell it before December 31, 1948, and take any loss that might come to the Treasury. If you are going to pass legislation like this it seems to

me we are on the wrong track. Another thing, it gives permission for the President and the State Department to reduce the tariff which is now on scoured wools of 34 cents a pound. If the farmers of this country cannot get along on the price they have now, what are they going to do when you reduce the tariff? It is poor legislation. You ought not to vote for it at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thought I heard the gentleman mention something about the tariff. How does the gentleman feel about reducing the tariff on woolen textiles?

Mr. RICH. I do not want to reduce it on anything. If you reduce the tariff on any commodity in this country, whereby you wreck the woolen manufacturers, the farmers, the sheep growers, and the labor of this country, I am against it. I have always been against it and I always will be against it. The Republican Party has always been for a high tariff, and it has made this country the greatest country on earth. Do you think I am going to stand for something of that kind? Not on your tintype. I am not built that way.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, possible abuses of retirement privileges by officer personnel are bringing serious criticisms upon the War and Navy Departments of our Government. In the War Department in the period May 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, I find that 1,283 Regular Army officers were retired for physical disability. For all other reasons only 408 were retired during this period. That means three out of four were found physically disabled by examining boards.

In the Navy, during the period May 1, 1945, to May 1, 1947, I am advised that 2,864 were retired for physical disability, and only 732 for all other reasons. Here the ratio of retirements for physical disability is nearly 4 to 1.

Since these appear to be disturbing figures, I have secured from official Government sources figures for comparison on the number of physically disabled persons in civilian life. Having noted that the greater number of retirements for physical disability are in the grades of general officer or colonel in the Army, and that a large number of Navy physical disability retirements are in proportionate grades, I assume that we may safely consider only ages 35 to 64.

And here is what we find in civilian life: Two percent of the males in ages 35 to 44 are physically disabled, 3.7 percent of those in ages 45 to 54, 6.4 percent

in ages 55 to 59, and 12.1 percent in ages 60 to 64. Yet in the services the percentages of those retired for physical disability runs 75 percent or more among the men retired in the comparable colonel-general age brackets. And the fact has been brought out that many high-ranking officers who retired from the services as physically disabled went immediately into industry at very lucrative salaries.

Now what can be the reason for this condition? How has the percentage of physically disabled reached such alarming heights among officer personnel? Who makes up the retiring boards, and on what basis do they judge physical-disability standards?

It is true that personnel retired for physical disabilities draw in some instances higher retirement pay than they would draw for length-of-service retirement. And it is true that physical disability retirement pay is not subject to income tax. It is likewise true that retirement pay for length of service is in only a very few cases higher than disability-retirement pay. But these should not be deciding factors.

I make no accusations at this time. I simply call attention to the facts, for I find them disturbing. I think this matter should receive serious thought from the membership of the Congress during the period prior to our reconvening in January. A request has been made by the House Committee on Armed Services, partly at my suggestion, that the services provide us with full and accurate information on this subject during that period, and that careful attention be given to correcting abuses if abuses exist.

In the belief that it may prove interesting, I file herein a table of retirements by officers of the Regular Army. I regret that I have not been furnished a similar table for naval officer personnel.

Retirements of Regular Army commissioned officers, May 1, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1946

Grade	Physical disability	Other retirements (age or service)	Wholly retired ¹	Total
General of the Army.....	1	—	—	1
General.....	—	1	—	1
Lieutenant general.....	8	3	—	11
Major general.....	136	28	—	164
Brigadier general.....	160	47	—	207
Colonel.....	831	287	—	1,118
Lieutenant colonel.....	91	38	1	130
Major.....	31	3	1	35
Captain.....	16	1	—	17
First lieutenant.....	9	—	—	9
Second lieutenant.....	—	—	1	1
Total.....	1,283	408	3	1,691

¹ Do not receive retired pay.

On Jan 1, 1947, 5,701 commissioned officers of the Regular Army received retired pay.

NOTE.—Non-Regular officers are not placed on the Regular Army retired list. They are certified to the Veterans' Administration for retirement. From Dec. 31, 1941, through Dec. 28, 1946, 26,056 were so certified. May 7, 1945, through Jan. 3, 1947, 18,525 were so certified.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman obtained similar information with regard

to the retirement for disability of Reserve officers, in comparison with retirement for disability of Regular officers?

Mr. SIKES. I do have some information on that but I do not have as complete information on it as I do for the Regular officers. I find that the percentage of Reserve officers who have been retired for physical disability is very small in comparison with the over-all number, and that of the number of Reserve officers who are examined for physical disability by examining boards only about one-third or less are retired. By comparison it is my understanding that nearly all of the Regular Army officers who are examined for physical disability by examining boards are retired for physical disability.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not that a rather strange situation?

Mr. SIKES. I find it so.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking with regard to the wool bill. Hold your hats, taxpayers, you are about to be taken for another ride.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1498, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly discussed on previous occasions, and I am not going to take very much time at this late hour of the day for a general discussion of the subject.

I am taking these few minutes to call attention to the fact that the bill which is now before us is identical with the bill which passed both Houses and was vetoed by the President except for the fact that section 4 which provided for the imposition of import fees and quotas under the provisions of section 32 of the AAA Act has been eliminated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to section 4 which was stricken out of the bill. Is it not a fact that the authority conferred under section 4 was a discretionary power in the hands of the President as to whether or not he wanted to impose import fees or a quota?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; it was the same provision which has been applicable at one time or another to something like 40 different agricultural commodities. It vested in the President power and authority to make investigations and determine whether or not support-price programs on agricultural commodities were being interfered with by reason of imports. The provision as to wool simply put it on the same basis as other agricultural commodities which come under the provision of section 22.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A good many of the newspapers and editorial writers have said that legislation provided for an increase in the duty on wool, and I would like to have the gentleman make it plain that it did no such thing and there was no increase authorized in the duty on wool in that bill.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because he is absolutely right in his statement that the bill in itself did not provide for any increase in duties. I might say that in all the time that I have been a Member of Congress I cannot recall any bill which was so persistently misrepresented in the press, especially in editorial columns, as the wool bill which passed the House and was vetoed by the President. I am not blaming the press so much for that misrepresentation as I blame the State Department for passing out information which constituted misrepresentation as to the character and purpose of the legislation. But I do not want to spend any more time going into that particular phase of the matter.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The bill reported by the House certainly authorized the President to increase the tariff to the extent of 50 percent, did it not?

Mr. HOPE. It gave the President the authority that he now has as to a number of other commodities, to either impose a quota or an import fee which would be in effect an increase in the tariff under certain conditions, if certain findings were made and he decided to use his discretion and found it was necessary to do that in order to prevent the support-price program from being interfered with.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that my distinguished colleague very studiously refrained from confessing that the President was ever to exercise his discretion in that certain situation to which the gentleman has referred. Some of the Members said it was a discretionary matter with the President. I took the position at that time, and I still think I was correct in saying that it was not discretionary with the President if the findings justified and indicated the necessity for an increased duty.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, it was necessary for the President to make a determination based upon the findings of fact. That determination was based upon whether or not he concluded that the imports were interfering with the support-price program. That was a matter that necessarily must have been left to his discretion.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and that is the only discretion he had to exercise. Now, after having asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation and then report back to him, if they indicated that the imports were interfering with the domestic program he had no alternative other than to impose it at that time.

Mr. HOPE. No. It was still up to the President, in the exercise of his discretion and judgment, to determine whether or not, based upon the information furnished by the Tariff Commission, imports were interfering with the support-price program.

Mr. COOLEY. But he had to make his determination based upon the findings of fact, and if the findings of fact indicated no other alternative, he had to make it?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, but he had to make the determination. It was not automatic.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the first place, it was discretionary on the part of the President to ask the Tariff Commission to make the investigation.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree that is the only discretion he had.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Afterward he had to concur in the findings of the Tariff Commission, and if he did not find that the facts submitted by the Tariff Commission were in accordance with his views, it was discretionary with him whether or not he wanted to exercise his power.

Mr. COOLEY. It would not have been a question of being in accord with his views, but in accord with the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me also that under section 4 the President could only impose such fees as would bring the price of foreign wool up to the price wool is supported under the wool program. Is that not true?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct.

Now, I do not want to get into any further discussion of the provisions of the other bill, because that is water over the dam. The President vetoed the bill. The Congress did not override the veto. While I think the other method of approaching the problem was preferable, we were not successful in solving it that way, and we are now coming here with what I think is the second best way of affording a price-support program for wool.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I am wondering whether the gentleman can advise me whether he would accept an amendment. Instead of 90 percent of parity it could be fixed at a higher price, if the Secre-

tary of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation so desired.

Mr. HOPE. No. I do not believe I would be in a position to accept that amendment.

It has already been brought to the attention of the committee that the parity price on wool does not at this time reflect a fair relationship as between wool and other farm commodities or a fair relationship with the cost of production, and for that reason among others, I do not believe that I could consistently agree to the amendment suggested.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that the Commodity Credit Corporation today is supporting certain commodities at higher than 90 percent of parity? For instance, cotton is being supported at 92½ percent and some commodities at a higher price because of the necessity of stimulating production. Would not the gentleman be willing to look to the same people who have discretion in all Steagall commodities to determine what is the proper price above 90 percent of parity to make the same determination in the case of wool?

Mr. HOPE. The support price of wool which we are asking in this bill is the same support price that has prevailed since 1943. Practically all other prices are now far higher than they were in 1943. I do not believe that it is out of the way to urge that the 1943 price should be continued. I realize that the gentleman's amendment does not necessarily reduce the rate at which the price would be supported, but it would give authority to support the price at a lower rate, which I do not believe would be desirable at this time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The only thing "comparable price" means is that wool would then be given the same treatment that other agricultural commodities enjoy under the parity formula of the Steagall amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; as a matter of fact we are not stabilizing the price of wool at the comparable price. There are some other commodities in the same situation as wool where the Department of Agriculture has determined a comparable price and use that for stabilization purposes. But that is not true of wool. If that provision were in the bill it would result in a price 4 or 5 cents higher than the price now contained in the bill.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. The bill now before us is the Senate bill and has passed the Senate.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. Should it be amended it would then go to conference and in this jam we are in there would be very little probability of its becoming law at all.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has raised a very good point and one to which we

must give consideration in this late stage of the session, because unless the bill can be passed in its present form it certainly is very doubtful as to whether it can become law at this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman will remember, of course, that the original O'Mahoney bill regarding which the gentleman from North Carolina read a letter from the President to Senator O'MAHONEY, contains the very thing we are talking about here, a comparable price. We were trying to change the formula that put wool on a parity with other commodities. Is not that true?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. And as to the comparable price some of the members of our committee did not want to go along with it. This is the compromise. This is the only thing that has ever been found which would meet the issue. We might just as well not pass this bill if we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts because that is the reason the bill was introduced in the first place.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. I appreciate the contribution he has made by calling attention to that fact.

Just briefly in conclusion I wish to bring the attention of the committee to the fact that the situation has changed somewhat as to wool prices in recent weeks.

There has been a stiffening of the price as far as the better grades are concerned, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts. That is fortunate in that those grades have been selling higher than the support price would have been and there has been that much more wool on the open market. We want all of the wool to go to the market place that can possibly go there. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been able to sell some of its stocks of wool because the better grades have gone above the parity price. That is all to the good, and we are glad that is the situation because it means that in the end this operation is not going to be as costly to the Government as it would be otherwise. It means that the loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to be less but it does not in any way lessen the need for this legislation because we do not know what the market may be or where it may go between now and December 31, 1948, at which time this program will end. The Army, so I am told, wants to take some of the stock pile of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, of course, that will help in the liquidation and will cut down the loss that will be sustained on account of this liquidation. So I think those who have been fearful of the cost that might accrue under this legislation can vote for this bill with the assurance that a change in conditions has reduced the probable cost considerably.

I hope that the committee will approve the bill without amendment and that we can send it to the President in the form in which it was passed by the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter has been debated on the floor formerly and I think every Member is acquainted with the provisions of the present bill. It has been passed by the Senate. There is no question in the world, in the event we give favorable consideration to the bill, but what the President will approve the legislation. It is absolutely necessary to protect the wool industry in America. There is no other way around. I do not think the membership of this House wants to put the great wool industry out of business.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not get this legislation we are not going to get any legislation at all. It is up to us to make that determination here and now. The committee is in possession of all the facts in connection with the whole situation; therefore I do not see any necessity for prolonging the discussion. We are only attempting to give the wool grower the same treatment that the producers of other agricultural commodities received under what is known as the Steagall amendment, a fair price. A parity price to the wool growers under the parity formula is not a fair price. That is the reason this legislation changes the parity formula with respect to wool. It is just simply doing justice to the wool growers of America.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I favor this measure and I favor it for the benefit of the wool growers of the entire Nation and particularly of my own State. Its enactment will be in simple justice to them. But there is another group dependent upon us in this matter of the price of wool.

I would like to say this: in addition to the white men there are in my State about 60,000 Navajo Indians and others who are nomadic, living upon their sheep, and the price of wool means everything in their economy. They are hard pressed now and up against the limit of subsistence. So, I am thinking in behalf of the 60,000 Navajo and Hopi Indians who produce wool and depend upon it for their very living. It is even better to give them a fair price than to furnish them charity. They prefer it rather than charity.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Some of the statements which have been made during the debate on this matter might indicate or tend to indicate that this support program was not needed. As the gentleman has pointed out, we are faced with a situation that we either take this bill or no bill at all. Now, if we have no bill at all, its

natural result might be that the market for wool at present levels might go to pieces.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it would go to pieces.

Mr. COOLEY. Because we have a tremendous surplus hanging over the market at the present time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it will take this legislation to give the wool growers of America reasonable protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Veterans' Affairs has worked diligently and I want to report to the House that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported five bills we believe should pass, the President and his Budget Bureau notwithstanding. But to date the veterans' legislation Congress has passed has amounted to very little, because the insurance time-extension bill simply gives the veterans a chance to apply for insurance. It is a commercial matter. The veterans pay for it. It should not be called a benefit, in fact. The House has one very important bill—the Patterson bill—which would give service presumption to chronic and tropical diseases.

This bill has passed the other body. I want to bring to the attention of the House again that if we do not pass the Senate bill which is now on the Speaker's desk, which gives the blind, the double arm amputees, and the double leg amputees automobiles, we are depriving the men, the most seriously wounded, of transportation that they can use in securing jobs. There are only 12,000 affected. They are the last ones of the group that are always classed together for rating purposes. The cost would not be great and would cover a period of 3 years. I know no Member wants to go back to his district and face a blind boy, when a boy with a leg off or a boy with both legs off can get an automobile, and say, "You cannot. The Congress did not choose to give you a car; it was not willing to do it." The bill was discriminatory last year. This rectifies that.

We passed other legislation out of our committee, Mr. Speaker, that is vitally needed. I do not know how the Members can go back and I do not know how I can go back and tell the veterans of various organizations where I have been asked to speak in the hospitals and say, "No, the Congress has passed millions and millions of dollars for relief to foreign countries and never counted the cost, but we are not passing legislation for the veterans because of the cost."

The Congress cashed the terminal-leave-pay bonds for the able-bodied, but did nothing additional for the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, there is other much-needed legislation already passed by the other body which is on the Speaker's desk, legislation which your committee on veterans' legislation passed first but which has not been acted upon by the House. The other body passed the on-the-job training bill, the subsistence-allowance bill, the bill for increased allowances for disabled taking vocational training, the amputee-car bill and the institutional farm-training bill which the House already has passed.

I believe the leadership will bring up those bills for action tomorrow. I still have faith. I do not believe that faith will be betrayed.

Six months, when the House will reconvene, will be too late for the men and women in school and in training.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object to this request, but I want to serve notice at this time that I shall object to any other requests to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the statement made by the very able gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I am in full accord with her that there has not been very important legislation concerning veterans passed by this body, and we would be sorely remiss in our duties to the veterans if we did not fully enact legislation that has been recently passed by the Senate.

Yesterday afternoon I called the attention of this body to a bill, S. 1394, which was passed by the Senate unanimously and now is languishing in a committee in this body. I was much surprised today when the majority leader issued his statement to this body in which he quoted from the President's speech of last January 6. The majority leader said:

That statement can leave no question about the opposition of President Truman to additional veterans' legislation of any consequence.

I say that is not true. The President has yet to veto any bill concerning veterans' legislation which has been passed by this Congress. I am confident that he will not veto the type of veterans' legislation having senatorial approval. If the legislation the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has spoken to you about, including S. 1394, passes this body there will be no Presidential veto. Of that I am confident. If we adopt and approve these bills which the Senate has passed unanimously, there will be no Presidential veto.

Let me tell you what I suspect is the real motive behind the majority leader's remarks. For some unknown reason the Republican leadership of this body is attempting to avoid the consequences of

bottling up veterans' legislation. It is common knowledge that they will not permit S. 1394 and other measures recently passed by the Senate to come before this body for action. Now there is great demand for this legislation. Disabled war veterans need the assistance provided by some of these bills, and particularly in S. 1394 thousands upon thousands of veterans have been pressing for an increase in their subsistence allowance in order to meet the continued rise in the cost of living.

The majority leader, in the prepared speech before this body today, has expressed deep concern over the possibility of a Presidential veto of additional veterans' legislation. I cannot understand, at this late date, his solicitude about a Presidential veto. Certainly such concern was not manifest with regard to other important measures which have been passed through this body under the guiding hand of the Republican leadership. I refer now to the Taft-Hartley bill and to the tax bills. I suggest to the majority leader that the proper way to place the onus on the executive branch of the Government is to give it an opportunity to perform its function. Bring these important veteran bills before this Congress. Let us perform our legislative function under the Constitution and then let the record clearly show whether or not the President will veto these extremely important measures. The responsibility for the passage of these measures is directly that of the majority party and its leadership. No searching and grasping from disconnected portions of the President's speech of last January can relieve the majority leadership of this body from its responsibility.

Again, I agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that this is a part of the unfinished business of this Congress and in good conscience we cannot face our veterans at home unless we act now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue, until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool in the continental United States and Territories at the price it supported wool in 1946.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the support prices for the various grades and qualities of wool; and may make discounts from support prices for off-quality, inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, at the governors' conference in Salt Lake City.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special order heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—LAWRENCE MICHAEL AGAINST HOWARD W. SMITH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The motion to dismiss of the contestee in the contested-election case of Lawrence Michael against Howard W. Smith for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia, filed in this office July 25, 1947, is transmitted herewith for reference to the appropriate committee.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

AMENDING NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 4395 to amend the National Housing Act to increase insurance on FHA title VI loans.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NO. 1 FAILURE OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—SUBSERVIENT TO THE REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1946 the Chicago Daily News printed a dispatch from Washington which gladdened the hearts of the members of one of the most powerful lobbies operating at present in this country. The headline said, "How lobby helped weaken housing bill."

The story read in part:

The housing bill passed the House this week with the guts cut out of it—and it was a luncheon club that did the gutting.

Sitting around a luncheon table, Washington secretaries of construction trade associations decided they didn't like the idea of price ceilings on old houses or subsidies to stimulate building-material production.

So they went to work, and soon every Member of the House was getting telegrams from lumber dealers, contractors, real-estate firms, builders, and architects in his district.

Then the story quotes Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, as follows:

"We've got a gang in power who think solely of the consumer and usually in terms of 'protecting' him," said Nelson.

He was referring to the Democratic administration, which was launching an aggressive emergency housing program in the early months of 1946.

From the warped viewpoint of the real-estate lobby, protecting the consumer is a bad thing. They schemed cleverly to end this protection, but could not overcome the Democratic administration backed up by the Democratic Congress.

That was in 1946, prior to November 6.

Sure the Democratic Party wants to protect the consumer, and we were proud of it.

But the Republican Party came into control of Congress in the fluke elections of '46 and the real-estate lobby has literally "gone to town."

Six weeks before the session opened the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards told members to wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents.

Cushioned decontrol of rents is a nice way of saying "Let us get rid of the protection that keeps the consumer from being at the mercy of greedy landlords."

Under the pretext of extending rent control, a bill was finally passed which I termed "a monstrosity." It was in committee when I first saw this strange creature known as the Housing and Rent Act of 1947—H. R. 3203.

Actually, this bill killed the existing emergency program to get housing for veterans. It was supposed to remove

all the restrictions on commercial building. Restrictions that had been put in to give builders of living places for veterans a chance to compete against money-heavy commercial and industrial builders for scarce building materials.

The real-estate profiteers and speculators are doing very well under the existing housing shortage, and profits are much higher in commercial construction than in home building, so big business did not like the provisions that held it back to let home building go ahead faster.

The real-estate lobby cracked its whip and the Republican majority in Congress jumped through the hoop.

The result: Congress enacted a hodgepodge and a monstrosity known as the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947.

Of course, the nastiest thing about this bill was the cruel joker provision which gave landlords the right to extract a 15-percent rent increase from helpless tenants. It gave tenants the choice of going for the 15-percent jump now or really getting blackjacked later on. In effect, it has been misnamed a "voluntary agreement."

Many helpless tenants really know what it means by now.

This bill was delayed in the other body until late in the session and then sent to the White House as part of a carefully laid political scheme.

If the President did not sign this phony bill, which gives a little protection to the consumer, the Republicans said brazenly they would pass no rent control law.

So the question was whether it was better to protect the consumer at least to the extent of some curb on landlords' greed or whether to have no law and put all tenants completely at the mercy of property owners at once.

Of course, neither choice was a good one. But the President decided wisely that a little protection for the consumer was better than none, so he signed the bill after issuing a blistering statement castigating the real-estate lobby and pointing out the evils of this bill.

I said this was part of a well-planned political scheme. It was. The Republicans deliberately held off the choice of a bad bill or no rent control bill at all until too late in the session for a better law to be pushed through before the old one expired.

Like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, the real-estate lobby said that nobody needed to be afraid of them because landlords wouldn't take unfair advantage of the privileges they were given under this bill.

Well, hotel rooms rented on a monthly basis were freed from rent control under this bill. Hotel operators around the country promptly dropped the mask of being grandma and stood revealed as the ravenous wolf.

Rates were increased as high as 200 percent. Even flop-house rates soared upward in an inflationary spiral. It was plain that the same thing would have happened to other tenants without the meager protection they receive under this bill.

This breaking of its promise is typical of the performance of the real-estate lobby.

Last year the real-estate lobby said in canned news releases that elimination of price controls would speed construction of homes and lower the cost of homes.

So price controls were removed. Prices of homes soared skyward. The veteran making \$40 or \$50 a week had a fine selection of homes—jerry-built cracker-boxes—that he could buy for from eight, or nine, or ten thousand dollars.

That was the lower costs that the real-estate lobby promised. But the real-estate lobby is not much interested in the people who do not have seven or eight thousand dollars lying around in loose cash.

The real-estate lobby's promise to solve the housing problem if government controls were removed stands today as a cruel mockery to the homeless veteran—as cruel as its repeated statements that there is no housing shortage.

Yes, the real-estate lobby actually makes that argument. They say there is no housing shortage. They say it is just overconsumption of existing space. Look what we are doing now? Have you seen the figures for June 1947?

The real-estate lobby has a simple solution to this so-called overconsumption of existing space. They would just raise rents so that families would have to move into smaller quarters and then all the folks with plenty of dough would then have nice places to live in.

Of course, it might be a little uncomfortable for a veteran and his wife and baby to have to live in one room instead of two or three, but the real-estate lobby does not worry about that—any more than they worry about being trapped in untrue promises of reducing building costs and meeting the needs of veterans.

In *Mein Kampf*, Adolf Hitler gave his theory of propaganda. It was to pick a big lie and keep repeating it. If you repeated it long enough, Hitler believed, you would get the people to believe it.

Apparently Hitler's theory has not gone unnoticed in this country, or has it?

Recently in headlines, the weekly publication of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Mr. Herbert U. Nelson, the lobbying gentleman we mentioned earlier, wrote as follows:

The realtor who sells homes in our country can certainly offer the best buy in the world today and in all history.

This unbelievable brazenness shows how little the real-estate lobby cares for the homeless veteran and how much it cares for the blood money that can be extorted during the present housing shortage from homeless veterans desperate for a place to live.

What a favor the pious talking real-estate lobbyists offer the veteran in "the best buy in the world today and in all history." The homeless veteran can buy a crackerbox worth \$3,500 at most for only 8 or 9 or 10 thousand dollars or he can do without a decent place to live.

This is directly the result of the real-estate lobby's spectacular success in winning from the Republican Congress the

ending of the Democratic administration's housing program.

Small wonder that President Truman asked Congress to investigate this slick outfit. Small wonder that the Senator from Ohio, the Republican Party whipcracker in the other body, said that he would like to investigate the lobby. Brother, could we give it a whitewashing—and how.

In fact this lobby is so powerful that it continues to block passage of a housing bill of which the Senator from Ohio is one of the coauthors. This lobby is so slick and so brazen that one of its spokesmen said that because the Senator from Ohio had the temerity to cosponsor a bill to help build homes at decent prices and to help tear down the festering slums that bring such juicy rental returns, the lobby would block the Senator's Presidential ambitions for espousing such socialistic legislation.

Imagine a lobby that is able to be even more reactionary than the Senator from Ohio, who is now disclaiming having any part in writing the famous labor bill of 1947.

The Senator from Ohio would like to investigate the real-estate lobby—he says—but actually he knows that such an investigation would reveal the utter subservience of the Republican Congress to this lobby, so you may be sure that nothing will be done to expose this high-pressure group of vote swayers. A Democratic Senator introduced a resolution for the probe, but the Senator from Ohio did not give it the green light and so nothing happened. This was another victory for the real-estate lobby. Actually the record of the lobby's victories in this Congress is astounding.

Let us run down the complete list of what has been done to sabotage veterans' hopes for a home and to take a little more from you and me to fatten the pocketbooks of the landlords and rich contractors.

Here is a brief story of the sell-out of homeless veterans:

The so-called voluntary 15-percent rent increase hit millions of persons and added fire under the inflation boiler the Republicans are stoking so busily in their program of high prices and low wages. This unfair boost hits veterans and non-veterans alike, but the Republicans are more concerned with helping the rich get richer and the poor to the poorhouse.

The real-estate lobby won meat-ax cuts in appropriations for housing agencies and Federal aid to local low-cost housing programs. Veto by appropriation is what you call this, Mr. Majority Leader. I might say to the genial gentleman from Indiana, the majority leader, who so very frequently refers to the use of the Presidential veto, that your party has used a very effective and devious stratagem—"Veto by appropriation."

The real-estate lobby won removal of the controls on nonhousing construction, giving the green light to builders of virtually everything but homes to go in and outbid home builders for scarce materials.

The real-estate lobby won approval by the House of the joker bill which calls for sale of 166,000 units of Government-owned housing for cash only. Real-

estate profiteers have the ready cash, homeless veterans do not. Fortunately at present it is bottled up in the other body.

The real-estate lobby prevented passage of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill to get housing in the price range of those who need it most.

And one outstanding thing that they did do in the other body was to approve the President's reorganization plan on housing and home financing. Where there is life there is hope.

A spokesman for the real-estate lobby has testified openly that the place for poor people to live is in the poorhouse. With the help of the Republican majority in Congress they will wind up by having even moderately well-to-do people living in miserable, inadequate housing.

The Republican majority in Congress and the real-estate lobby have not even bothered to try to hide their callous indifference to the welfare of the general public.

If homeless veterans and the millions of others who are not properly housed today do not go to the polls and vote for the Democratic program of decent housing for all, in 1948, we will continue to see the real-estate lobby rule Congress.

I, for one, do not believe that the veterans who defeated the powerful armies of Germany and Japan are going to let the real-estate lobby win this war.

The lobby has nothing but dollars on its side. The veterans have a weapon as strong as the bullets they used in the war—their ballot. Ballots can win the housing war.

Let us win it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in five instances.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress, first session, draws to a close. In the next few months the people of our Nation will have an opportunity to evaluate the accomplishments and lack of accomplishments of the past 6 months of Republican rule. The record has been written. The sins of commission and omission are clearly set forth. The people will be the final judge. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] said on April 15, during debate, "The Republican Party now has the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action."

Now let us see what they have done and what they have left undone. Their sins of commission and omission are equally damnable.

HIGH PRICES

First, let us look at the high cost of living. The Republican leadership for over 2 years have been fighting all attempts at inflation control. They wrecked OPA last year with the promise that the law of supply and demand would

bring prices down in a few months. Has the price of living come down? No. The cost of living is 17 percent higher today than it was in June 1946. This pleases the speculators and the profit hogs, but it does not please the people. And the Republicans have done nothing about the constantly rising cost of living.

TAXES

Now let us talk about taxes. With great fanfare, the Republican leadership has twice forced through the House a tax-reduction bill which gives a larger percentage of net take-home pay to the high-income individual than it does to the wage earner. Do not let them fool you with their phony percentages. The tax-cut bill was for the greedy and not for the needy.

At a time when our national debt was over \$259,000,000,000, all thought is given to inflationary tax cuts, instead of the sound fiscal policy of paying our debts. The greedy with swollen incomes yell for the cut. But the President vetoed a cut at this time for the benefit of the people.

MINIMUM WAGES

Now let us look at minimum-wage legislation. The Republican leadership has been holding hearings on the minimum-wage bill. But I understand no action will be taken by this session of Congress.

They do not favor raising the 40-cent minimum wage to 60 cents per hour, which means raising wages from a paltry \$3.20 a day to a subsistence wage of \$4.80.

Some of the big low-wage industries do not want a \$4.80 per day minimum wage for their employees, and they have flashed a red light to their Republican friends in the Eightieth Congress, and, of course, they have obeyed.

This pleases the low-wage-paying industrialist, but the people do not like it.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Now let us look at labor legislation. Yes; they have been successful in passing the Taft-Hartley bill, an omnibus antilabor bill which the Republican leadership promised would solve all industrial disputes.

Only a few days after this became the law of the land over the President's veto this law failed in its first big test. The coal miners struck. A half-million workers not only struck but they refused to sign a new contract binding them to the terms of the Taft-Hartley bill.

If the Taft-Hartley bill was what its sponsors claimed it was, why did not the coal operators use it against John L. Lewis? There are only two answers. The law is either unworkable, and unconstitutional, or there was employer appeasement for political purposes. Mr. TAFT says the law does one thing, and Mr. HARTLEY says the law does the opposite.

It will take years of court trials to determine what this hodge-podge of ill-considered legislation will do.

One thing we know: It will not bring industrial peace to America.

RENT CONTROL

Have you had your rent raised lately? Well the Republican leadership wrecked rent controls with the Wolcott bill, and millions of American citizens are faced with rent increases, which are not limited

to 15 percent which they tried to make the people believe.

On hotels, motor courts, and new construction, all rent controls have been removed. The rent gougers are having a holiday. This pleases the landlords' lobby but it does not please the people.

HOUSING

Are you a veteran, and do you need a house to live in?

The Republican leadership wrecked housing control in the Eightieth Congress by choking off appropriations for control and allocation agencies and removing price controls on building supplies.

Prices skyrocketed and essential residential building for the medium-income-bracket civilian and veteran is not available.

This may please the real-estate lobby, but it does not please the returned veteran or the civilian who wants to buy a home at a reasonable price.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RECLAMATION

What about the conservation of our national natural resources?

Do you live in the Missouri Valley, where the floods are costing hundreds of millions of dollars in damage?

The Republican leadership has drastically cut flood control, soil conservation, and western reclamation projects appropriations.

They say this is economy. And the wealthy taxpayers agree; but the people in the flooded Missouri Valley think it is tragic.

And the people of the West, hungry for land, water, and hydroelectric power, are desperate.

Yet the wealthy taxpayers are pleased; but the real wealth, the rich topsoil of America, is swept down the muddy Missouri Valley River to the sea.

They made a few paltry cuts in the taxes, but they cost the people millions by these cuts. The people do not like it.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

In conclusion, the Eightieth Congress should not adjourn on July 26. The Republican leadership should keep Congress in session until they have passed legislation to solve the vital national problems that are affecting the lives of every citizen.

The people need housing. They want inflation stopped.

They want protection against monopoly.

They desperately need flood control.

They need extension of social security into fields of avocation not covered at present.

The aged need a Federal old-age pension. The people need Federal aid for education. The people want world-wide peace. And Congress should busy itself with national problems and stand ready to implement international agreements. The duties and obligations of the Eightieth Congress will not be fulfilled if they adjourn July 26.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION OF PALESTINE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago a joint resolution was introduced in both Houses of Congress directing the Secretary of State to request His Britannic Majesty's Government immediately to abolish the emergency regulations at present governing the administration of Palestine and to reestablish a civilian administration and civil liberties to the people of Palestine.

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to House Resolution 237 and Senate Joint Resolution 149. These resolutions stress the fact that the entire regime in Palestine and the present system of administering the country are illegal and that a de facto state of war exists in that country. It emphasizes the conditions prevailing there, which converted Palestine into a police state the like of which could not be found anywhere in the western world, and the sufferings and hardships imposed on the population under a most brutal totalitarian regime and a rule of ruthless tyranny.

The occasion for that resolution was the confirmation of death sentences pronounced on the three Hebrew patriots, Jacob Weiss, Mayer Nakar, and Absalom Habib, for alleged participation in the liberation of prisoners from the prison of Acre on May 4, 1947, in which no British lives were lost and in which some 250 political prisoners, both Hebrew and Arab, were liberated.

These death sentences passed by a so-called military court, whose legality could not be reasonably established by any stretch of interpretation of international law, have been confirmed by Lt. Gen. G. H. R. MacMillan, commander of the British forces, on July 8, in complete disregard of the plea of the United Nations Special Committee as well as the plea of numerous public bodies inside and out of Palestine. This attitude of the British administration in Palestine, shocking as it is, is even more appalling when one takes into consideration the fact that three death sentences against Nazi generals in Italy, found guilty of the wanton murder of some 350 innocent Italian men, women, and children, have been commuted by another British commanding officer, thus presenting to the world the utterly distorted conception of clemency applied to avowed criminals, on one hand, and cruel and undue punishment applied against sincere idealists and patriots fighting for the liberation of their country and their people, on the other hand. Mr. Speaker, it is only natural that such an attitude on the part of the government of one of our principal allies in the last World War—a government with whom the Government of the United States has maintained over a period of decades the most friendly relations, a government to whom we recently extended very substantial economic help, a government which is continually calling on our people for assistance in the solution of its problems and difficulties—should have provoked in this country, and particularly among the elected representatives of the American people, a wave of shocked indignation and anger. For the American people and its representatives

are not prone easily to forget that we have recently concluded a victorious war against fascism and nazism in the defense of the very principles of democracy and freedom menaced by the totalitarian states.

The American people and its elected representatives cannot and will not forget that millions of American boys have taken up arms and waged many battles in which hundreds of thousands of them have given their lives so that all men might be free and no people, big or small, be oppressed any longer. For the American people and its elected representatives are fully aware that freedom is one and indivisible all over the world and that an attack on the freedom of any people on this earth is an attack on our own freedom, which we cherish and defend with all our might. The American people and its elected representatives cannot and will not forget that the totalitarian powers whom we defeated also began their attacks on freedom by attacking the Hebrew people, by choosing this peaceful and unarmed people as a test case in order to ascertain how the civilized world would react to an attack on them. We cannot and will not forget, having succeeded in their drive against the Hebrew people, the Nazis established their technique of attacking other peoples one at a time until the time came when they felt strong enough to attack the whole world, including our United States. We must always keep in mind that whenever an attack against democracy is being planned, the Hebrew people are the first victim but they are never the last. Other peoples follow and finally a conflict engulfing the whole civilized world becomes inevitable. We are determined that this shall not happen again and that is why it is our duty to stop aggression against a peace-loving people who have suffered enough—I should rather say too much—before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago words were spoken in the Senate of the United States with dignity and firmness reminiscent of the days of our Declaration of Independence, when the representatives of our people rose to the heights of historical greatness which established our Nation as a guide to all peoples of this world on the path of great achievements for true democracy and freedom and equal opportunity for all. When these words were spoken in the Congress of the United States, no one dared to think that the British Government's reply to these noble sentiments of the representatives of the American people would be another act of cruelty and inhumane brutality against the remnants of the Hebrew people. It is utterly unfortunate that even the most pessimistic among us have misjudged the depth to which the present government of Britain has sunk in its fall from the days of Dunkerque to this day. It is most discouraging to know that the same British Navy which so gallantly fought against tremendous odds in the last war is being used now to commit acts of piracy on the high seas against unarmed vessels on a mercy mission of repatriating to their homeland those remnants of the Hebrew people

who by some miracle escaped the crematoria and the gas chambers to which the Nazis had committed them.

On July 18, 1947, the steamship *Exodus*, carrying some 4,500 Hebrew repatriates to their homeland, was attacked on the high seas some 17 miles outside of Palestinian territorial waters by a swarm of British destroyers, which rammed her, attacked her passengers with tear bombs and small arms fire, and put a boarding party on her main deck. Three persons aboard were killed and over a hundred sustained serious injury. One of the dead was an American crewman, the ship's first mate, William Bernstein, age 24, of Los Angeles. Bernstein leaves a widow and one child.

The battered mercy ship was towed into the port of Haifa, where the repatriates were transferred to British prison ships, and they are now being taken to a French port whence they will be sent back to concentration camps in which most of them have spent up to 8 years, including 3 years after their so-called liberation.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly need to add any remarks to this story drawn from dispatches by American press agencies. The inhuman cruelty of this action of the British Government speaks for itself. But it would hardly be fitting for us to condemn the British Government unless we are prepared to act ourselves in order to come to the rescue of those unfortunate human beings tossed around on the high seas as if they were the scum of the earth.

Let us not forget for one moment that we have not only a moral obligation toward these people, that we would be guilty of forfeiting our Christian principles by standing idly by while they are being driven to despair and maybe even annihilation. Let us not forget for one moment that these are the very people who were one of our most gallant allies in the recent war. Mr. President, permit me to cite from my personal experience. I had the good fortune to be assigned to fight in the last war on one sector of the European underground. I have seen those people fighting almost with their bare fists against the most highly mechanized armies of Nazi Germany. I have seen them risking their lives every minute of the day.

I have seen them holding in check entire divisions of the mighty Wehrmacht while they were only a handful of meagerly armed but determined fighters who believed in the precepts of our own great Jefferson that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God. They have found the courage and the endurance which it took to resist the Nazi invader in their own faith in the principles of freedom and in their faith in us, their allies. They were sincerely convinced that we meant every word of what we said when we declared we were fighting that war for a new democratic order, for the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. Those people have every right to expect us to fulfill the promises that we so generously made to them. They have every right to ask of us that we liberate them in fact and not

make a mockery of the term liberation by leaving them for three full years after liberation day behind barbed wires in the very same concentration camps in which millions of them were annihilated. We would be guilty of complicity in one of the most hideous crimes against humanity if we let them down in this hour of their need; if we permitted them to be thrown around from one port to another instead of stretching out a helping hand to put an end to their wanderings and untold sufferings.

Mr. Speaker, we have assumed moral and legal responsibility for the fate of these people. We signed in 1924 a treaty with Great Britain taking a full share of responsibility for the fulfillment of the mandate over Palestine and for the establishment of a home for those very same unfortunates who are now being denied it.

At this very moment it cannot be fully ascertained whether these victims of Nazi brutality and callous breaches of solemn promises by the western democracies will be forced back into France. I would not take it upon myself to criticize or to pass any judgment on the action of the French Government in this difficult situation. The French Government may feel that whichever way it acts it will be open to some criticism. If it refuses to admit them some people may say that the French Government is thus prolonging the agony of these unfortunate wanderers. If it does admit them, some may say that the French Government is thus becoming an accomplice to the British Government in driving these sufferers back into the concentration camps in which they have already been kept much too long. For my part, I have too high respect for the noble traditions of the great French Republic to doubt even for one moment that whatever action the French Government may take it will be motivated by its concern for the welfare of the 4,500 human beings and not by considerations of political expediency. I am even more inclined to express this belief because of the most praiseworthy record of the Government of France in its unremitting efforts and continuous endeavors to help the Hebrew repatriates in every possible way, despite innumerable difficulties of a political or other nature which they encountered in this field.

But I definitely refuse to believe even for one moment that the French Government would permit itself to be duped by ill-placed considerations of pseudo humanity. These people have undergone untold hardships with one purpose in mind: To leave Europe, the huge graveyard of their kin, and to start a new life in the Holy Land. To force them back into Europe would be cruel and inhuman. I am confident that the great Republic of France will not commit such a disgraceful act.

It would be a very sad day for me and for every decent American when we would have to compare the attitude and actions of the Government of France with the attitude and actions of our own Government and reluctantly come to the

conclusion that the comparison was not in favor of our own American Government. It would be a sad day indeed for every decent American when we would have to come to the conclusion that our Government has made numerous declarations of sympathy and compassion, that it did not spare noble phrases and brilliant formulas but, alas, did not lift a finger in order to undertake real action.

Another representation to the British Government by our President would expose once more our country and its highest elected officer to the unpalatable treatment which he incurred on the occasion of numerous previous representations to the British Government on the Palestine matter, which were either ignored or rebuked in a manner incompatible with the dignity of his high office and the respect due to it. It would be futile to expect any results from such a representation after the unsavory experience which we have had with the British Government to this date.

On May 12, 1947, I was one of the 15 Representatives and Senators, Republican and Democratic, who wrote to the President urging that he implement the repatriation program of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, by lending trucks and ships to the displaced Hebrews and facilitating their return to Palestine before another winter sets in. We received word from the State Department that the consideration of this program must wait for the United Nations Special Committee report and that no action can be taken pending the current investigation. Whether or not this argument has sufficient validity is a matter into which I will not enter now, aware as I am of the limited time of my colleagues. But there is one thing about which one cannot have any doubts and this is that regardless of pending inquiries and determination of long-range policies for Palestine or the formulation of the future status and administration of that country, it is our indisputable duty to act and to come to the rescue of the 4,500 Hebrews in this immediate emergency. We cannot wait any longer while human beings are being kicked around from port to port, some of them being shot, some being drowned, and some perhaps disappearing through suicide. Our President has a duty to act and act now. President Truman must extend the protection of the United States to these people. We must at once recognize their full legal right to repatriate themselves to Palestine, a right which our President has so convincingly expressed on several occasions, and we must without further delay assist them in returning to their homeland—Palestine.

I am certain that any step taken by President Truman to guarantee the safety of these Hebrews under the United States flag in returning to Palestine will meet with the most enthusiastic response both in the United States and among decent people the world over. I know of no course other than this one which would be morally justified and legally right under international law.

The 4,500 have been victims of a criminal assault in which some of them lost their lives, others sustained injury, and the rest fortunately survived. We cannot, without losing all claim to decency, let them be the victims of repeated assaults under the pretext that they have to wait for redress from the United Nations. There is no conception in Anglo-Saxon law or international law which imposes on the survivors of a criminal assault the repetition of that same assault while the court is in session.

There is no law in any part of the world which would permit a criminal to repeat his crime while he is being tried for it. We cannot afford to become accomplices to such a repetition and that is exactly what we would be if we do not take action to save the victim from the hands of the criminal.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CAN WE AFFORD TO FOLLOW HERBERT HOOVER'S ADVICE AGAIN?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in February 1947 Mr. Herbert Hoover was asked by President Truman to go to Germany for the purpose of making a study of her economic problems. It was the second time after the defeat of nazism that Mr. Hoover was asked, as an expert on relief, to give the American people the benefits of his long experience and knowledge.

The American people were entitled to expect from the former President of the United States impartial, fair, and disinterested advice as to what should be done about Germany and her place in the postwar European economy.

I believe the American people will have many reasons to be sadly disappointed with the report Mr. Hoover submitted to them. For the report disregards American interests and security, and is neither impartial nor fair, nor does it attempt to make a decent analysis of the true German economy as it really was in 1936—the year Mr. Hoover wants us to use as a guidepost for the future. Since Mr. Hoover selected 1936, and since in his report he calls all the measures intended to control the German economy fallacies, it behooves us to point out a few of his own fallacies.

It is beginning to be more and more apparent that we never learn anything. We do not learn from history; we do not learn from experience; and it is sad to say that we often cannot learn from our so-called national leaders.

From history we should have learned that there can be no security from German aggression until Germany is made a peaceful nation and without power to wage war. The Versailles Treaty should have taught us that Germany's aggression has an economic foundation. This fact was not recognized after World War I, and all our efforts were concentrated on controlling Germany's military aspirations. In 1919, the Allies imposed some prohibition on the production of military goods; they imposed limitations on the size of the army and navy, but

they forgot to impose the only restrictions that count—the restrictions over Germany's industrial production and, in general, over her national economy.

But if we forgot the most essential controls, the Germans did not. Anxious to learn their lesson in order to make good the mistakes that led them to defeat in World War I, they proceeded to study the causes of their debacle. As early as 1923, the Germans had already developed their economic general staff. British Gen. J. H. Morgan of the Allied Disarmament Commission watched them in the middle twenties preparing for World War II. He reported his findings but nobody wanted to study them. From him, as well as from other sources, we learned that the Germans promoted the latest technique, knowledge, and research of synthetic and other methods of production in order to give the new Germany the industrial potential she needed to conquer Europe. Nor did the Germans overlook anything in order to procure the working capital needed for the expansion of their industrial plants. Germany was badly in need of money. This she obtained when the western powers were only too eager to get rid of their postwar savings. Indeed, they almost begged Germany to accept their investments. The reason advanced to the people was that Germany needed the foreign money in order to enable her to pay her reparations.

When Germany claimed that she could not pay reparations unless she was allowed to sell abroad her increased industrial products, Germany's neighbors fell into this trap and thus were economically weakened.

When German industrialists complained of too much competition from her neighbors—that is when Germany began flooding Europe with her increased industrial output—her neighbors complied with Germany's wishes by entering into cartel agreements which enabled Germany to manipulate Europe's foreign trade. The result of these cartel activities was that Germany's war potential was built up. Still, nobody complained about it. Nor did anybody complain when it was found out that Germany used deliberate ruses in order to entice her erstwhile enemies. Germany's foreign cartel partners said nothing about these ruses even when they discovered them. Even now the people hardly realize what these ruses meant. In the case of steel, for instance, in order to induce her erstwhile enemies, France and Belgium, into joining them in forming the international steel cartel, the Germans deliberately asked for a smaller quota of steel than Germany could easily produce. Immediately after the establishment of the cartel, the Germans proceeded to manufacture much more than their quota, paid the stipulated fines, but succeeded thus in becoming the dominating partner of the cartels. Thanks to this deception, the Germans soon succeeded in controlling Europe's entire steel and coal production. By virtue of these agreements, not only did Germany obtain the power over the economic life of

Europe, but by exploiting to the limits many cartel devices, she was in a position to obtain direct access to military developments abroad. And thanks to the cartel system also, Germany was able to maintain an intelligence service which the best spy system could not procure for her.

GERMANY'S INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

The industrial development so auspiciously begun under the Republic was perfected under the Nazis. The foreign-trade manipulations for the purpose of giving Germany power to wage war and for the specific aim of weakening her neighbors and prospective victims reached tremendous proportions in the thirties. Her industrial potential reached a new high; she became the most powerful industrial nation in Europe prior to World War II. Some of the basic plants built or enlarged in the twenties, thanks to the farsightedness of the German industrial leaders and the general staff and thanks to the huge loans granted by the democratic nations, were found to be small in the thirties.

As the crescendo of industrial production mounted, the Germans suddenly discovered that the coal mines were not sufficiently mechanized to meet the labor shortages. They began to realize that the demands for coal-tar derivatives had been underestimated; as a result more ovens and distillation plants were built. As the growing importance of her aerial warfare became apparent, the Germans realized that the aluminum production as originally planned was too small. Germany's aluminum production was pushed to the extreme and became second to none.

The development of Germany's industries could not be arrested in the thirties. Each unanticipated expansion of one industry put new burdens on other industries on which it was based. Thus a large aluminum output called for more electric power, and the new electric power in turn called for a greater coal output. This was also the case with magnesium, when that metal was found to be of strategic importance.

Indeed, the thirties were unsurpassed insofar as they pertain to the expansion of Germany's industries. For instance, the development of synthetic oil was deliberately held down in the twenties because of its high costs. In 1935, oil production reached 300,000,000 tons, and by 1939 it was 1,500,000,000 tons.

When we speak about Germany's development of her industrial production, we mean in the first place, Germany's heavy industry, and by heavy industry we mean her war potential, her ships, her transports, her arms, her ammunitions, her tanks, and the metals necessary to expand the industrial capacity to produce and to service them. In order to accomplish the program the original German planners had in mind, it was necessary to build a powerful iron and steel industry. The iron and steel industry is essentially the best yardstick to measure a nation's ability to wage a successful war. This can best be illustrated by

casting a glance at the increase in production of pig iron. Between 1933-38, Germany's pig iron production was increased 350 percent, while ingot steel output tripled during the same time.

An increase of such magnitude requires capital. The best way to illustrate what Germany did in the thirties is to show where her money was spent. Official records available show that between 1933-36 Germany spent most of her income on the development of her capital goods or heavy industry. In 3 years after Hitler seized power, Germany's new investment in heavy industry was increased almost 500 percent while it increased only 200 percent in the consumer goods industry. Thus, in 1933 the amount of new investments in heavy industry was 309,000,000 marks and in 1936 it was 1,593,000,000 marks. In the consumer goods division the increase during the same year was from two hundred and forty-eight to four hundred and ninety-one million marks.

These figures are extremely important and must always be kept in mind in discussing Germany's economy as it was known in the thirties. These figures clearly show that German economy before the war was deliberately planned to give Germany the mastery over Europe—war or no war.

The following economic realities indicate the magnitude of Germany's prewar conquest.

In 1936, with less than 10 percent of the area and 20 percent of the population of Europe, Germany accounted for one-half and in some cases much more than one-half of the total European production of heavy industries that furnished her war potential—coal, pig iron, steel, nitrogen compound, machine tools, and machinery. In other categories such as cement, sulfuric acid, electric energy, cotton and wool yarn, and paper, more than one-third of the European production was concentrated in Germany.

Already in 1936 it was clear that no European power was in a position to withstand Germany's economic pressure. The regular trade practices of Europe were upset by Germany's machinations and dumping. No nation could oppose Germany's ruthless trade practices. In the fields of heavy machinery, machine tool industries, and aluminum, Europe became subservient and dependent upon Germany for supplies. The total result was that Europe's trade and commerce were not in a position to prosper.

WHAT MR. HOOVER SHOULD KNOW

Such, in brief, was the picture of Europe's economics in 1936. Historical data pertaining to Germany's ulterior motives are available. Brig. Gen. J. H. Morgan described Germany's ulterior motives as far back as the twenties in his recent book, *Assize of Arms*.

All European businessmen and financiers have, at one time or other, had to suffer from Germany's methods of trading. American businessmen who had dealings with Germany and Europe in the middle thirties are only too well acquainted with Germany's practices.

The American chemical industry knows from sad experience how eager the

German chemical industry—and especially the infamous I. G. Farben—were to allow the development of the chemical industry in the United States prior to and subsequent to World War I. The European victims of Germany in World War II know full well what Germany's economic domination meant to them between 1939-45.

One would naturally have assumed that Mr. Herbert Hoover, although fate was kind enough to bring him into this world in the United States, thus sparing him the indignity of living under German domination, would have also learned the fundamentals of European economics, even as any fair-minded economist or historian.

Mr. Hoover was spared the horrors of living in a Nazi hell during World War II, but he has visited Europe many times. He has just returned from a special mission to Germany and has written a report to the President in which he states that he has exhaustively examined Germany's heavy industry and plants. On the basis of his analysis, Mr. Hoover claims that Germany should be allowed the full development of her heavy industries, and he chose 1936 to illustrate what Germany could do for Europe.

I do not know what titles Mr. Hoover has to show that he is an expert on German economics. If he is entitled to give all sorts of advices to the American people, the most elementary ethics would require that he tell the American people the most elementary facts about Germany—namely, that the German economy was a war economy. This was not expecting too much, since the people are entitled to know the significance of Mr. Hoover's recommendations in terms of our security and the peace of the world. Mr. Hoover should have shown the American people what Germany's economic domination of Europe in 1936 meant to the world at large in terms of blood, sweat, and tears and also what it would mean in the future if Germany were to be allowed to go back to 1936.

GERMANY'S WAR POTENTIAL

One was entitled to expect Mr. Hoover, who only a few months ago personally inspected the existing German plants—some slightly damaged but mostly intact and ready to dominate and enslave Europe again—to tell the American people that Germany is only militarily defeated, but that her economy is only temporarily at a standstill. After all, he knows and can reveal that the base of German aggression—the base which it built up over the last 25 years and which enabled her to nearly conquer the world—is virtually untouched. To take the case of machine tools, Mr. Hoover, as an outstanding engineer, surely was best qualified to tell the people that before the war Germany, with a population only one-half as large as that of the United States and with an economy not as highly mechanized as that of the United States, had a machine-tool, machinery, and machine-building capacity larger than that of the United States. Since Mr. Hoover studied German industry in 1947, did he not see for himself that Germany, after losing the war, still possesses

over 4,000,000 tons of undamaged machine tools? Why did he not tell the American people that the existing German machine-tool industry is decidedly a menace to the peace of the world?

Apparently, Mr. Hoover is not perturbed about the tremendous machine-tool industry. Not only does he not mention its existence, not only does he not make any comparisons between Germany's available machine tools of 1936 and that of 1947, but he has nothing to say about making use of these machine tools as reparations. On the contrary, he makes the flat recommendation that no installations be removed for reparations. Since Mr. Hoover has certainly heard of the pathetic demands of the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency at Brussels, he apparently is satisfied that the 18 nations clamoring for machine tools are not entitled to any consideration.

Mr. Hoover speaks of 1936 as the year which enabled Germany to supply the world with the necessary products, but he does not tell of the tremendous increase of Germany's steel capacity between 1933-36. We believe the American people are entitled to get a concise analysis from Mr. Hoover dealing not only with the steel industry but with other phases of Germany's future ability to wage war as well. Mr. Hoover, therefore, should have dwelled on the present-day industrial capacity, technological and scientific organization, economic assets owned outside Germany and the nature of Germany's highly integrated economy which makes Germany today still a potential threat to the safety of the world.

Mr. Hoover is rightly concerned about Germany's ability to make a living. But speaking about Germany's ability to export, Mr. Hoover sees only two alternatives: either Germany exports the products of the light industry or the heavy industry. Mr. Hoover dismisses light industry because the products of the light industry would compete with those of Britain in which case Britain's economic situation would further deteriorate, and this in turn would call for an additional loan from us. Consequently, Mr. Hoover is in favor of Germany's exporting the products of her heavy industry.

AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Mr. Hoover does not attempt to show the economic consequences involved in his recommendations to make Germany's heavy industries work for Europe. Does Mr. Hoover not know that sheet steel, strip steel, rolled steel, railroad equipment, machines, dynamos, can be produced in Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, Britain, and so forth? If it is true that Germany's light industry can be a menace to Europe, as Mr. Hoover fears, the menace of Germany's heavy industry can be infinitely greater. For it is obvious that the non-German heavy industries will be penalized in order to allow the German heavy industry to work full blast. A stagnant heavy industry in Western Europe will retard the development of Germany's victims. Their entire economy will be affected, unemployment will increase and their

currency will deteriorate still further. In order to stave off hunger and political bankruptcy, these nations will turn for additional loans to the United States, thus nullifying Mr. Hoover's efforts to alleviate the harassed taxpayer.

Mr. Hoover's logic is difficult to follow, indeed. The European nations have suffered because before the war their economy was allowed to be dominated by Germany. They have suffered from the domination of German heavy industry; they bled, fought, and finally were freed from the German nightmare with the promise they will have "freedom from fear." Surely the Allies did not mean that after the war the victims of Germany would be asked to submit their entire economic life to the will of the very same leaders of the German heavy industry. True, Mr. Hoover himself did not promise Europe "freedom from fear," but it is difficult to see how his humanitarianism can allow him to make such an uncharitable recommendation. And what makes this recommendation more ominous in his answer to the all-important problem of control over the German war potential, with the simple statement: "And twosome of intelligent men could see that there is no arms production and that no industry is manufacturing or storing material for evil purposes."

Mr. Hoover refuses to learn anything from history, from economics, and from the deeds of the German heavy industry. A most casual glance at Germany's economic activities of the thirties could easily convince him that it was not only the arms and ammunitions the Germans stored that paralyzed Germany's victims, but German machine shops, steel capacity, and, above all, German domination of her neighbor's machines, technique, and economy.

HOOVER IGNORES THE COAL PROBLEM

Mr. Hoover was sent to Germany as an expert on economics, yet he does not mention coal as a commodity which Germany has in abundance and which she can produce and export in considerable quantities. Mr. Hoover, after all, as an engineer knows that before the war Germany used to export tremendous quantities of coal and coke to Europe. Since Mr. Hoover chose 1936 as a yardstick, it is only fair to point out that that year over 50 percent of Europe's metallurgical coke originated in Germany. Therefore, Mr. Hoover surely must know that Germany, in those days, had enough coke to smelt the metal for its own war machine and had enough left over to supply a large proportion of the fuel needed to operate Europe's furnaces. When the German war machine needed more coke, this was provided without difficulty, as can be seen from the tremendous increase in production of metallurgical coke between 1933 and 1938. German statistics show that in 1933 Germany produced 21,200,000 tons of coke, whereas in 1938, her production had more than doubled and amounted to 43,500,000 tons.

Surely Mr. Hoover, in his exhaustive studies of Germany's economics, is aware of the fact that in order to prepare her

war machine, Germany used tremendous quantities of coal in her steel, power-generating industries and as a basis for production of heavy chemicals, synthetic oil, plastics, and so forth.

Mr. Hoover also knows that coke-oven byproducts were extensively used in the German coal-tar-dye industry, explosives, plastics, poison gases, and so forth.

Moreover, Mr. Hoover knows that Germany's peacetime economy cannot possibly consume the tremendous prewar coal production. For instance, during World War II, synthetic oil and synthetic rubber based on domestic German coal, effectively replaced imports of rubber and oil. In many instances, coal served as a raw material for ersatz products and became of increasing importance in the German industrial self-sufficiency. Obviously, a peaceful Germany would not need to consume her coal for purposes of making these synthetics.

Does Mr. Hoover realize what he is asking the American people to underwrite when he says:

The Anglo-American zones should abandon the destruction of plants, the transfer of plants for reparations, and the level-of-industry concept and start every plant—the heavy as well as the light.

NAZIS STILL IN CHARGE

Perhaps Mr. Hoover, when he made his exhaustive study of Germany's heavy industries, did not have the time to see how useful the Germans have been to Europe, when they got the power. At any rate, Mr. Hoover knows that the German Bizonal Economic Committee was given authority over economic matters January 1, 1947. In the Ruhr the Germans have had their way for quite a while now. They have been running the plants, controlling and supervising the coal production, and for all practical purposes, have been doing as they pleased. Some of the most important German industrialists with the worst Nazi records have been placed again in charge of their plants and mines. The notorious Nazi, H. Dinkelbach, is again the head of the whole steel industry; the Hitler supporter, Poensgen, is again head of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke; the Zangens Rasch, Abs, Hugenbergs, Vits, and other high Nazi profiteers are again in charge of their businesses. But Europe has not been getting the products of the Ruhr. Mr. Raymond Daniell was in Germany at the time Mr. Hoover was studying very hard. Describing the general bad faith of the Germans as he saw it, he had this to say, March 30, in the New York Times:

In this atmosphere it is only natural that blackmail, bribery, and chicanery of various sorts have become weapons of patriotic resistance. There is no open sabotage, but thefts of coal on a large scale, black-market dealings in the produce of the Ruhr factories and holding back farm produce—all are on the increase. The Germans are still using coal and factory products of the Ruhr to soften the peace.

Would Mr. Hoover be kind enough to explain how he would supervise the activities of Messrs. Zangen, Dinkelbach, Hugenberg, and so forth, and what methods does he envisage to see to it that the Germans do supply the coal and other raw materials to their former victims

and neighbors? The implication of the recommendation Mr. Hoover advocates is that Germany should be granted full use of her coal for the production of her prewar steel and power industries, heavy chemicals, synthetic oil, plastics, and so forth.

One would have expected Mr. Hoover to inform the American people that, in the past, Germany's domination of the European economy was based on Germany's hard coal. By the same token, one would have expected Mr. Hoover to enlighten the people by telling them that over 80 percent of Germany's hard coal production is concentrated in the western area of Germany now under the control of the British and French authorities. The coal production figures for these regions at the end of World War II are as follows:

	Percent
Ruhr	69.2
Aachen	4.2
Saar	7.2

COAL AND THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

Mr. Hoover knows full well that in 1933, Germany produced only about 109,000,000 tons of hard coal. He also knows that in 1938, under the stimulus of Hitler's 4-year war plan, production of hard coal rose to about 185,000,000 tons.

When Mr. Hoover advocates the full exploitation of every heavy and light German plant, he also advocates Germany's use of all the coal produced in Germany. If this policy is implemented, it would mean thwarting the recovery of Europe. Or, translated into American terms, the longer Germany postpones the delivery of coal to Europe, the less able will Europe be to recover and the more money the American taxpayer will have to spend in order to sustain Europe.

Mr. Hoover, as a close student of European politics, also knows that when he speaks of German heavy industry, he means the Ruhr and Rhine. Further, having studied Germany as he said he did, he knows that Germany's war potential is located in the Ruhr and Rhine. This, notwithstanding, in his lengthy report to the President, he does not have one single word to say about the control, either political or economic, of the Ruhr and Rhine and, indeed, he expressly stipulates that "German industry must be operated by Germans themselves if she is to serve all nations equally."

Since Mr. Hoover does not mention it, presumably he does not want to impose any controls over the Ruhr and Rhine. However, as an expert economist, he knows that Germany has dominated the European economy by cartelizing the heavy industry which, in the first place, meant the steel and coal industries of the Ruhr and Rhine.

HOW GERMANY DOMINATED EUROPE

How did the German heavy industry always use its power? Again I take up the year 1936 which Mr. Hoover takes as a yardstick. The greatest service he can render the American people and humanity at large, is to tell what Germany did in those days. When Germany wanted to enslave the economy of a neighbor, she withheld steel and coal from him and this placed Germany in a

position to dominate her neighbor's politics, thinking, economy, and, indeed, her entire life. When Mr. Hoover asks for the complete development of Germany's heavy industries and when he insists that these industries be left exclusively in German hands, he places the entire European economy in jeopardy again, because the net effect of his recommendation is going to be that the German cartels will continue to dominate Europe and to prepare for World War III. For Mr. Hoover's information, the international steel cartel dominated by Germany's heavy industry is still functioning in Luxembourg.

None of the above-mentioned facts were explained by Mr. Hoover in his report of March 24 to President Truman. What is more, when Mr. Hoover deliberately glossed over the paramount importance of Germany's exports of coal to Europe, he withheld the most important fact the people must know, namely, that coal is deliberately being withheld from Europe in order to lead America to believe that the only possible recovery for Europe lies in Germany's development of her own heavy industry.

Mr. Hoover has this to say about Europe's recovery:

If Germany's heavy industry is allowed to function she has an ability to export and would become an asset to Europe's recovery.

It is rather significant that Mr. Hoover forgot the most important element essential to Europe's recovery—export of coal from Germany.

Had Mr. Hoover shown the slightest deference to the economic realities of Europe, he would have pointed out that although Germany in 1936 succeeded in becoming the most important economic power in Europe, she still found enough coal and coke to supply her neighbors with the following quantities:

	Tons
France.....	10, 078, 000
Belgium and Luxemburg.....	9, 929, 000
Italy.....	8, 143, 000
Netherlands.....	7, 566, 000

Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Denmark, Greece, and other countries were also able to obtain their share of coal from Germany.

WHY NOT COAL FOR FOOD?

Germany's average prewar yearly export of hard coal was about 30,000,000 tons of coal. At present, Europe's recovery requires 100,000,000 tons a year. Allowing for the present state of the rolling stock and other difficulties, it is only fair to assume that in the near future Germany could export 50,000,000 tons of hard coal to Europe.

At the prevailing prices, an export of 50,000,000 tons of coal to Europe can provide Germany with \$1,000,000,000 revenue which would enable her to import the necessary foodstuffs and would thus materially help the American and British taxpayers.

This, Mr. Hoover did not mention. Nor did he mention the fact that for the past year every effort is being made by the British authorities to retain the maximum coal for the use of the German in-

dustries. Or, to quote General Erskine, in November 1946 Deputy Military Governor of the British zone, "The necessity for stimulating moribund German industries through the utilization within western Germany of hard coal mined there, led to the decision."—To stop the export of coal to Germany's victims.

Mr. Hoover does not explain nor even mention General Erskine's unilateral decision to punish the industries of France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. And yet in his capacity as an economist, humanitarian, and statesman, he knows full well that unless France obtains about 20,000,000 tons of coal she cannot rebuild her own industry and that the inevitable consequences will be that she will have to fall back upon new American help. Not only does Mr. Hoover not say anything about these economic consequences, but he does not even mention the Saar. But even assuming that France obtains the coal supply from the Saar, she cannot fully exploit her iron ore deposits in Lorraine. If France cannot use her iron ore from Lorraine and cannot obtain the coal from the Ruhr, she will have to send her ore to the German Ruhr—exactly as was the case in the thirties. This means that although Germany lost the military war for the second time during this century, she won her industrial war.

IF GERMANY WINS

And what will be the consequences of Germany's winning her industrial war? Mr. Hoover's aversion to communism need not be stressed here. Nor for that matter need we stress ours. It is essential, however, to exploit further the political consequences of Mr. Hoover's recommendations to rebuild Germany's heavy industry.

The Communist parties in France and Italy, forgetting for a moment those of the smaller western nations, are very powerful and have shown a remarkable ability to exploit the faulty thinking of some western European and American statesmen. They have succeeded so far in becoming powerful because they know how to exploit the trials and tribulations of the peoples of their respective countries. The longer plants are idle because of the lack of supplies from Germany, the greater the misery and want, and the more Frenchmen and Italians can be converted to communism.

It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Hoover does not seem to be worried about the plight of the industries in western Europe, nor about the workers who may be pushed farther left, which Mr. Hoover certainly cannot be said to desire. Since coal will have to be found somehow, it could come from Upper Silesia. The question is, How much? One of the important economic factors leading to the scuttling of the Versailles Treaty was the competition between Upper Silesia and British coal. The British antiquated coal industry, after World War I, found it very difficult to compete with the coal coming from the more modernized Upper Silesian coal mines. In those days, the Poles were able to sell their coal at lower rates to France and Italy, despite the

long sea journey and the long haul from Katowice to Gdynia. That is one of the reasons why, during the period between the two wars, neither the Polish Government nor its coal were popular with the British politicians.

Things have changed greatly since those times. Today, and until the British economic crisis is over, Britain would presumably not mind seeing Polish coal in western Europe. It would take Poland some time before she is able to husband her rolling stock and overcome the transportation difficulties generally prevailing in Europe. It will also take her time to increase her coal output to meet some of the heavier demands. Then, too, the deliveries will most certainly be subject to the prevailing political conditions. The political times being what they are, coal has become one of the most important "political" raw materials of the postwar world. This being the case, both the east and the west can play the same game. So long as the Hoover philosophy prevails and coal is withheld from western Europe in order to rebuild Germany again, Poland and eastern Europe can afford to wait and bide their time. This new economic and political power play can easily be based upon coal—Polish coal—even as the Anglo-American economic play is based upon the oil in the Middle East.

Western Europe lost heavily when the Germans were allowed to dominate the European economy in the thirties. It is bankrupt now because of it. And we also know that one does not cure a poisoned patient by giving him the same dose of arsenic. Nor does one cure the patient by giving him a substitute, but equally man-killing, arsenic.

Common sense suggests that so long as the policies of Mr. Hoover and those of like mind in the United States and Britain continue to be implemented, the industrial future and the democratic institutions of the nations which have been on our side in the recently concluded struggle are in jeopardy.

If communism has been able to recruit so many new supporters in western Europe, it was not only due to the fact that unemployed workers cannot be satisfied with Mr. Hoover's rugged individualism, but also because they cannot understand why they should be freezing and starving, so that the empires of Stinnes, Krupp, and Thyssen may be rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to present a very timely article written by Dr. Jean Pajus that appeared in the magazine *To Prevent World War III*. Dr. Jean Pajus is a former adviser to FEA in Washington, and to the Division of Cartels and External Assets in Berlin.

GERMANY—TWO YEARS LATER

(By Jean Pajus)

Germany surrendered on May 8, 1945. She capitulated because she was utterly bankrupt—militarily, physically and morally. No nation in modern times has succumbed in greater universal condemnation than Germany and no end of hostilities engendered so much hope in the hearts of men.

To many people, Germany was no longer a problem. Although they were more concerned with the dramatic sweep of events

than with the realities of life, these observers were ready to agree that certain measures were necessary to assure the final and definitive peace for the world. In general, most people were in favor of some measures against a possible revival of a bellicose Germany.

Two years ago, after 5 years of war, the peoples of the world were aware that peace must be built upon a firm foundation, that security from German aggression cannot be maintained without education, good will, and with the proper economic and industrial safeguards. They have had ample opportunities to see how Germany prepared her war by marshaling her economic power and how she succeeded in controlling occupied Europe not with bayonets alone, but with economic controls. One may also add that these thoughts were not the product of hatred or revenge, nor was it the product of the school of hard or soft peace; the people's desires were for a peace rooted in common sense.

WHAT WE EXPECTED

Specifically, the peoples wanted to see a new Germany, a Germany free of the traditional German authoritarian, militaristic, and ultra-nationalistic ideals which, in the past, have proved the bane of existence for Europe and the world. The world was tired of fighting and tired of the perennial Germany which knew only how to incarnate the pernicious spirit of evil. The peoples of the world may not have a great sense of history, but they knew what Germany had done to them.

The peoples of the world sincerely believed that the Allies, having suffered horribly for 5 years, had finally learned their lesson. The world was entitled to expect the victors to teach the vanquished how to live by showing them their own sincerity and good faith and, above all, introduce into Germany democratic economic and political principles needed to make a new start.

The Allies were entitled to demand reconstruction of the devastated territories, and they expected that the German economy would be placed at the service of Europe. They were also entitled to obtain reparations, restitution of stolen goods, and reconstruction of their devastated plants.

The peoples of the world wanted and were entitled to be given permanent safeguards against German renewed aggression. This meant not only nominal disarmament of the German military forces or destruction of a few military installations, but permanent Allied control of Germany's industrial war potential.

The peoples of the world wanted and were entitled to obtain guarantees that the German economy, equipped as it has always been to wage war, would henceforth contribute her share to the peaceful development of Europe; that she would never again be permitted to disturb the regular commercial practices by resorting to the use of dishonest devices in the field of commerce and industry, as in the past.

The peoples of the world were given assurances during the war that their wishes would be met. Solemn pacts were entered into. There was Yalta, there was Potsdam, and there were innumerable pledges by all the allied statesmen at Moscow, at London, and at Paris.

No time in history has witnessed a greater failure and bankruptcy of pledges and hopes than the past 2 years. The failure is the more tragic, because the peoples of the world have never been told the extent of the violations of the pledges; thus they are not in a position to assess the damage done to their future security. What is more, the people still do not realize that they have been told deliberate falsehoods usually cloaked under cover of mutual recriminations thrown by the erstwhile Allies against each other.

Two years after our victory, the world is witnessing the most unusual spectacle: Defeated Germany is enjoying the enviable position of being able to choose between two blocs. Germany, who cannot even be asked anything officially, is in a position to make her weight felt. Despite her plight, she is coveted and courted as no other nation. Germany knows it and she can again impose her conditions.

The new Germany has not materialized. The masses of the German people are today, less than ever, amenable to accept the principles of a democratic society. The German people at large, feel no responsibility for their crimes, nor do they feel responsible for the destruction of Germany itself.

Justice Jackson put his finger on the spot when he said in April 1947, "No people has a stronger will to survive and dominate than have the Germans. And Hitler's dual policy of multiplying the Germans and biologically weakening or exterminating their rivals will reach its consummation in a generation." This was the conclusion Justice Jackson reached after listening to the evidence presented at the trial of the war criminals at Nuremberg.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay has not seen any change of heart on the part of the German people. "The military government," he said, "cannot in full conscience restore the self-responsibility of government to the German people, who have not shown that they are willing to denazify their public life."

Meanwhile, we are losing ground day by day. The prewar traditional autocratic forces we had hoped to eliminate are inching back into positions of power and profit. So long as these traditional German forces are not eliminated, it is impossible to speak of a spiritual regeneration of the German people.

The forces that led the world to disaster are again in charge of business and political administration. The real democratic elements of the German people are rather small and they were never given a chance. They are dismayed because they were not invited to make their contribution to the rebuilding of the new Germany and they stand aghast when they see the results of the so-called democratization of Germany's public life. Having watched the activities of the Nazis in power, they are appalled when they discover that the German denazification courts were only able to find that Baden had 2 percent, Hessen 9 percent, and Bavaria 8 percent of unworthy officials.

These democratic elements in Germany were told by Justice Jackson last year, that there were 2,000,000 active criminals in German organizations. Moreover, they knew that in 1933 there were 17,000,000 Nazi votes.

GERMANY'S MIND TODAY

Germany cannot make her spiritual revolution so long as the traditional enemies of democracy are allowed to continue their work. These enemies of Germany's spiritual revolution were cleared by the German denazification courts because they were able to convince the judges that at one time they were regular church-goers, or showed courage during air raids, or were able to show that they have lost members of their families during air raids, or that they have lost property during the war, or have extended protection to persecuted minorities.

Nobody in his right mind will want to question charity nor deny fair play to the Germans, but the results obtained by the Germans in their efforts to undergo a spiritual change, clearly show that the Germans themselves have not made an attempt to recast their thinking and attitude toward those who led the world to disaster.

Yet one hesitates to condemn too severely the Germans for their failures of the past 2 years. The outside world always knew

that the Germans never had the proper leadership nor training in democracy. That is why the world expected the Allies to show them how democracy works. The Allies have failed. The sort of lessons we have shown the Germans in democracy the past 2 years can be gathered from our experiences in Bavaria. When it was pointed out to our political adviser, Dr. Walter Dorn, that in Bavaria 62 to 80 percent of the verdicts of the German spruchkammer, or denazification courts, were erroneous and that this was openly admitted by the Bavarian President Minister himself, Dr. Dorn replied: "Be careful. He is an old-line reactionary and a strong nationalist. If you offend him, he might resign."

The question is how can we expect the Germans to learn democracy if we appoint reactionary and nationalist politicians, and if we refuse to teach them what we mean by democracy?

Can we blame the Germans for their shortcomings, when the spectacle they see is not very edifying—to say the least. The Germans see tremendous power enjoyed and exercised by German magnates, industrialists, bankers, and spoilers of occupied territories, high officials who have contributed their share to the seizure of power by Hitler, and by others who helped to bring about World War II. The Germans find key positions, held by administrators in towns, districts, laender and on the bi-zonal level—men who now claim to be servants of liberty, but who, in reality, owe their positions to the prominent roles they played under Hitler. The same phenomenon can be observed in all four zones. In the Russian zone, leading Nazis suddenly become members of the Socialist Unity Party and collaborate with the Communists. In the western zone the Germans see millions of Nazis suddenly denazified without trial or benefit of hearing, as was the case last Christmas.

OUR ADMINISTRATION

Two years after Germany's defeat, we are forced to admit that the real tragedy of our occupation of Germany lies in the psychological attitude of the military government or rather in the lack of the proper psychological attitude toward Germany. We have shown so far misunderstanding, ignorance and lack of good faith, which in the long run is bound to cost us the victory. We have placed our dearly won victory in unsteady hands, we have selected officials without qualifications, some intellectually dishonest or incapable, others who are indifferent, still others who are realists, and what is more tragic, we have appointed officials who for years had strong economic and other ties with the real rulers of Germany.

What the allied administrators are doing in Germany is carefully noted by the average German. Their association with the former German leaders does not escape him and the common man cannot help but wonder—weren't the former leaders indicted along with the 22 war criminals at Nuremberg? Seeing his former leaders in the company of high Allied officials, the average German is led to believe that Nuremberg could not have meant what it said.

The average German, after listening for months to the testimony of Schacht and Von Papen, could no longer claim that he was not informed of the crimes committed by his erstwhile economic and financial masters. He was convinced that Schacht and Von Papen could never escape. What did he think when he heard the verdict from the highest Allied tribunal that Schacht and Von Papen were not guilty? Accustomed as he was to cynicism in Nazi high places, he could not help but reason that the Allies can show cynicism of their own. He naturally arrived at the conclusion that these two leaders of the Nazi regime had friends in high

places among the Allies who did not want to convict the real criminals of Germany—the bankers and industrialists. The same German could not help but think that the real masters of prewar Germany were right, because deep down in his own heart he knew that at Nuremberg only the accomplices of Germany's crimes were convicted and that the real culprits were deliberately allowed to escape into the international never-never of intrigue and politics. Moreover, the average German learned that the real spirit of prewar Germany was left intact because at Nuremberg only the crude and indecent side of Germany's nature—the Nazi side—was punished by the highest Allied tribunal.

ORGY OF NATIONALISM

The repercussions of the Allied failures have made themselves fully felt in many manifestations of a new truculent nationalism. This nationalism encompasses the whole political life of Germany. Everyone is a nationalist now. Even the Communists are enraged nationalists and they are fighting for the prewar integrity of the German territory; they are violently opposed to any cession of territory to Germany's neighbors. They are fighting against France's demands for the coal resources of the Saar. The Socialists, under the leadership of Kurt Schumacher, who was properly coached and trained in Britain, speak the nationalist language used by the Socialists after World War I; in their chauvinistic anti-Polish outbursts they are more virulent than the worst Junkers in their "Drang nach Osten" days. The Christian Socialists, carefully nurtured by American politicians, have inherited the mantle of Von Papen and Breuning and speak for the center party. The Liberal Democrats—a strange name for such a party—have organized a strong movement which provides the real hide-out for all the Nazis and reactionaries. Their solicitude for the German refugees knows no bounds and their defense of the prewar German territories provides them with the real drug the German masses are willing to absorb.

This nationalistic orgy is a direct result of the policies pursued by the Allies and by their representatives in Germany. The average German is now convinced that his own prewar forces were right after all, since the occupying authorities themselves are practicing fraternization extensively and are continually pushing the autocratic and conservative forces to the forefront—politically and economically. The tragedy becomes appalling and hopeless when the British go so far as to order the German authorities to reinstate to former prominent positions outstanding leaders in industry found guilty of high crimes against humanity.

One wonders how the British will try from now on to educate the new Germany when they ordered the reinstatement of Dr. Wolf Witzleben, Johann Benkert, Bruno Pohlmann, all very high officials of the notorious Siemens Electrical Co., of Germany—the biggest trust in the field which for years has been dominating the electrical industry in Europe.

The Siemens Co. and the above-mentioned officials have been proven guilty of the following crimes: slave labor, atrocities against foreign workers in concentration camps, soliciting and obtaining the exclusive monopoly of operating the electrical equipment and instruments at Auschwitz and Buchenwald.

It was thanks to the tremendous power wielded by the Siemens Co. in Nazi Germany, and the excellent technical ability of their directors, that the best methods of exterminating 10,000 human beings every 24 hours were installed in the concentration camps. The German courts went through the evidence submitted and carefully sifted the affidavits supporting the evidence. The German people were duly told about the Witzleben,

Benkert, Pohlmann roles in these atrocities and they were also told that there was no place in the new Germany for these officials. The verdict of the German courts was reversed by the British authorities and the German people were told that these three officials must be returned to power in the new Germany. This was the answer given the German workers who struck in protest against this iniquitous Allied verdict—the symbol of the new Germany.

THE NEW ANGLO-GERMAN FRIENDSHIP

Symbolic also, for both, the Allied world and the new Germany, was the report emanating from Germany at the same time that the General Electric Ltd. of London was negotiating for the purchase of a sizable block of shares of the Siemens Co., at the very same time the United States authorities were insisting on decartelizing the giant electrical trust. The meaning of these events is bound to make the proper impression on the average German; henceforth, he will know that there is a community of interest between big corporations of Germany and Britain, and that atrocities can be quickly forgotten and forgiven provided a satisfactory financial arrangement can be made between British and German interests.

While it is difficult enough to explain the doings of the military government to the Germans, it is well-nigh impossible to gage the consternation of the allied world which expected a new concept of justice to be applied to Germany.

During the final phase of the war, the democratic forces in Britain were given to understand by the Churchill Government that their sufferings were not in vain. The British people were told that justice would be meted out to the German criminals. A few months later, after the Germans surrendered, the labor government was swept into power and this time the British people breathed easier for they were sure that the people's government, not having any economic or financial tie-ups with the prewar German forces, would certainly see to it that the forces of evil would be eliminated from Germany. As good Britons they expected British justice to be set up as a model for the Germans themselves. The peoples of the world may not know too much about the relations between General Electric Ltd., and Siemens and its gas-chamber experts, but they do know that the tremendous war potential accumulated by the great German combines, must be destroyed. They have heard enough of the Goering, Werke, Bosch, I. G. Farben and others to know that peace will never be secure unless the war equipment built up by the German heavy industry is destroyed. Two years after Germany surrendered, the people are being told that in the British zone the most heavily industrialized of all—only 7 percent of the tank, aircraft, artillery, and other factories termed dangerous by the allied experts, have been dismantled. This is not what the people of Britain had hoped for. Nor did they expect that after 2 years of waiting, 18 nations, victims of German aggression, would receive only 6 factories from the western zone as reparations out of 1,557 plants earmarked for removal.

Nor, for that matter, will the people of Britain understand—if they are ever told about it—why Britain is keeping intact steel plants in Germany with a staggering total capacity of over 18,000,000 tons, whereas Britain's total capacity is in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 tons per year, and Germany's pre-Hitler domestic needs amounts only to 4,000,000 tons.

DEMONOPOLIZING GERMANY?

For almost 2 years now the British Labor Government has been telling the world that

the British people did not like the German monopolists any more than the rest of the world. Yet, in occupied Germany, each time the British authorities were asked by the American authorities when they would finally agree to implement article XII of the Potsdam Agreement calling for the elimination of excessive economic power from Germany, the reply invariably was that Britain is all in favor of a socialized economy and against private monopolies. As proof of their intentions, the British officials would invariably advance the record of nationalization of vital segments of their own economy in Britain. Moreover, the British authorities would extol the greatness of their plans to place the natural resources of Germany at the service of the people rather than leave them to the industrial magnates who led Germany to disaster. For 2 years, the British have been calling their plan socialization rather than nationalization. The purpose, they claimed, was to eliminate the power of the German industrialists. These good intentions have never been kept. Nor were any of the broad concepts dealing with the economic controls of Germany ever kept in the British zone. The answer is not difficult to find: Britain never really wanted to socialize the German industry. This attitude is common to both the conservatives and labor parties, because neither is anxious to forego the dividends from British investments in the Ruhr. This is also the major reason for the British hostility to the idea of internationalizing the Ruhr and other economic safeguards against renewed German aggression.

Instead of decentralizing the economy of the Ruhr, the British have tended more and more to concentrate the economic power there. Nowhere else is the British attitude better shown than in the flat refusal to do away with the past abuses perpetrated by the German industries and their activities in international cartels. The formula calling for the elimination of the abuses was simplicity itself and had the added attraction of not requiring an elaborate international machinery to enforce it. The formula merely stated that Germany must not be allowed to become a party to international cartel agreements. This, the British Government has flatly refused to accept. This refusal alone indicates the faith one can attach to the British policy of socialization of the German industry. Another characteristic of the British intention is their refusal to prohibit monopolistic practices in Germany.

After 2 years of Allied efforts to eliminate the greatest source of economic abuse known, the British have finally accepted the principle of decartelization, and have submitted a tentative list of cartels to be eventually decentralized. But the acceptance of the principle was accompanied with a whole string of stipulations, one of them being that the whole slate be subject to final approval by the zone commander. They further stipulated that the commander of the British zone must have final authority in determining the suitability of each particular German company and the method to be used in decartelizing the company. In other words, the problem of decentralizing the German industry will be left to the discretion of the British commander. Parenthetically, how bright the chances of decartelizing the German industry in the British zone are, can be gaged from the fact that the present commander, Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, has consistently opposed a law that would effectively break up German cartels in the British zone in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement. Other high officials are either connected with British cartels or are in sympathy with their aims.

VEREINIGTE STAHLWERKE EXCEPTED

The list submitted by the British to the American zone is the following:

Krupp, Goering, Flick, Haniel, Mannesmann, Klockner, Wolf, Ballestrem, Dagussa, Siemens & Halske, Ver. Industrie Unternehmungen, Ver. Elektrische Begwerks A. G., Eisleben, Chr. Dierig, Phrix, Feldmuhle Papier, Aschaffenburg, Carl Zeiss, Deutsche Continental Gas Ges., Gunther Quandt.

For a start, the list is not too bad, but the irony of the situation is that the biggest steel combine in Europe and the second largest in the world, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, is not even mentioned as a possible candidate for decentralization.

Is the omission of this steel combine purely accidental? One is inclined to believe that there must be a reason for this omission, since on September 4, 1946, the authorities of the British zone were asked to explain why Alfred Hugenberg, a former member of the Hitler cabinet, chairman of the board of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, one of the most important industrialists and war profiteers who had contributed tremendously to the Nazi Party fund at the time when Hitler was desperate for money, one of the men who contributed tremendously to Hitler's coming to power, was not removed from the managing board of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. The official British reply was "it takes a vote of the shareholders in the company to remove him as board chairman."

In plain language, the British refusal to remove one of the most important Nazis from the biggest steel combines means that:

(a) While the German state is dead, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke is still vested with sovereign power and can do no wrong, nor can it be punished for past crimes.

(b) The power of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke supersedes that of the Allied military government, which is specifically empowered to remove any German obstructing its administration.

(c) The denazification laws do not apply to the Vereinigte Stahlwerke.

Something must have happened during the month of December 1946 which would seem to indicate the greater weight which Hugenberg carries in the new Germany. That month, German trade-unions from the four zones met for the first time at Hanover, and overwhelmingly called upon the military government to apply the denazification laws in all Germany, especially in her heavy industry, and for elimination of the German monopolies. Instead of seriously considering these just demands, the United States authorities, for their part, saw fit to encourage the revival of the German National Industrial Aid Society—a trade-union movement which was heavily financed and sponsored by Alfred Hugenberg during the Republic. The new German trade unions are wondering why the legitimate demands of the trade-unions have not met with any success.

They have learned that ever since the times of Bismarck, and even before, the leaders of the German industry have followed the practice of associating themselves with powerful industrial organizations. These industrial associations have exerted tremendous influences on German economic and political policies regardless of the composition of the government in power. These industrial associations were behind the expansionist drives of the Kaiser as they were behind the Republic which has never made any attempt to interfere with the power of the heavy industries. Indeed, the economic history of the Weimar Republic is one of gigantic expansion of the biggest German trusts and monopolies. A casual glance at the origin of Vereinigte Stahlwerke and the I. G. Farben will be more than enlightening—it will provide a tragic drama.

The Nazis allowed the industrial associations to prosper because they were heavily indebted to them for their financial support. To compensate these industrialists, the Nazis made membership in their associations compulsory, changed their former names and introduced the principle of leadership into the operation of their associations. In most instances, however, the same men who had been elected representatives of industry prior to 1933 became the appointed leaders after Hitler's coming to power. Until '41, the top organizations in the most vital industry—coal—was the Wirtschaft Gruppe Bergbau. In the steel industry the top organizations had an official status, but the Reich Minister of Economics and other government agencies made use of them and their elaborate provincial organizations in putting into effect many of the economic controls required by the rearmament program and later by the war. In turn, these industrial organizations exerted great influence on the policy-making officials of the Nazi Government as to the nature of these controls and as to every step taken which affected their respective industries. In most instances, the leaders of the industry were high members of the Nazi party and especially appointed to implement the Nazi policies.

In 1941 a central top cartel was founded for every industry in Germany, largely through the efforts of Friedrich Flick, now being tried at Nuremberg. The first top cartel was in the coal industry. This top cartel acquired the absolute mastery of all other coal syndicates and many functions formerly exercised by the German Ministry of Economics were transferred to the top coal cartel. Although Flick and four of his closest associates are in custody, his other associates are still in charge of the coal cartel which is responsible for production of coal for the rehabilitation of Europe.

Flick, to be sure, is a very important criminal, and fortunately for us and unfortunately for him, he was caught, after Germany surrendered, in the United States zone. No such fate, however, befell his friends who happened to be at the moment in the British zone. Collectively, the industrial associations of which Flick was a member, did more harm to the world than Flick did. Yet most of the leaders of these associations and all the companies they controlled have so far escaped the Allied laws affecting the new Germany.

THE SMALLER CIRCLE AT WORK

Way back in 1940, even before the collapse of France, a group of these industrial associations, called the "Smaller Circle" or "Siebener Club" (Club of Seven Members)—used to meet regularly for the purpose of elaborating the expansionist plans for the Nazi government. The plans elaborated by this group later became the law in occupied Europe. The members of the Smaller Circle use to meet before the war too, but in those days they used to shape policies affecting the German secret rearmament plans, procurement of raw materials, war mobilization, etc., which were ultimately executed by public and semipublic agencies such as the coal cartel, the iron cartel, etc. This secret group of seven industrial associations consisted of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, Flick, Krupp, Mannesmann, Hoesch, Klockner, Gutchoffnungshutte. What has happened to the seven? After 2 years of the most heart-breaking labor and cajoling and begging, the British have finally consented to place five of them on the prospective list of cartels to be decentralized on the terms as mentioned above. It is worthy of note that neither the Vereinigte Stahlwerke nor Hoesch steel concerns are mentioned. The individuals rep-

resenting these concerns so far have fared very well. Wilhelm Zangen, chief manager and brains of the Mannesmann trust is safely protected in the British zone and was mentioned as one of the chief advisers in the reconstruction plans for the German heavy industry. Its chief deputy, Harold Rasch, was pushed by him to become the brains behind the Bi-Zonal Committee. It is only recently that he was succeeded by a so-called socialist, Victor Agartz. It is also worthy of note that both Zangen and Rasch have distinguished themselves as looters of occupied Europe. (See Prevent World War III, issue No. 19, p. 9, the Mannesmann combine.)

ERNST POENSGEN'S ROLE

Alfred Hugenberg of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke has already been discussed. There is one member of the Smaller Circle who deserves our special attention. He is Ernst Poensgen, almost totally unknown in the United States but in reality the most important man in the German heavy industry. His sphere of activity was entirely, unlike that of his colleague Hugenberg, in the international economic field. He was the brains behind the International Steel Cartel of Luxembourg which he organized in 1926, and which gave Germany the power of life and death over Europe's coal and steel. In 1932, immediately after Hitler's coming to power, Poensgen, together with Fritz Thyssen, pledged the entire German heavy industry in support of the Nazi regime. He was the brains behind the German top steel cartel and worked very closely with Flick, plotting the course of looting to be followed after France's defeat. In July 1940, after France's downfall, Poensgen called a meeting of the Smaller Circle and informed them that he personally was entrusted by General of the SS, Otto Steinbrink—at that time gauleiter for the iron and steel industries in France—to draw up a plan of distribution of iron and steel plants in France and Luxembourg, among the members of the Smaller Circle.

The records reveal that Flick was a little jealous of Poensgen's power and wanted to make sure that he, Flick, would get his proper share of the loot. Poensgen duly reassured Flick by telling him that "I will not pass on any project before discussing it with you."

Poensgen, it seems, had some redeeming features, because at one time he did propose that the original French owners be left with 25 percent of the shares of the companies to be looted. Flick, however, was decidedly opposed to the idea and tried to convince the Smaller Circle that the French owners deserved nothing. Perhaps this redeeming feature of Poensgen's would account for the following: Flick is now being tried in Nuremberg while Ernst Poensgen was especially recalled in 1946 from his retirement in Kietzbühl, Austria, in order to rebuild the power of the German industry because of his excellent contacts with the British cartels. He has been placed again as chairman of the Association of Iron and Steel Trade Manufacturers in the British zone. It is worthy of note that during the war after Flick had established his model top coal cartel, Poensgen was entrusted by the Nazi Party with the mission of establishing the top steel cartel—the Iron Producing Industry, May 29, 1942. Since Poensgen is again the head of the new German steel association, only one small change occurred since 1942 and a very minute one at that—in the title of the new German industrial association. And in order to make absolutely certain that there was no mistake, Poensgen was placed in charge of running again the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, at the end of 1946.

DINKELBACH—THE BRITISH TRUSTEE

Another person who deserves attention is Heinrich Dinkelbach, also of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. Dinkelbach is a prominent Nazi and has been the financial genius of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke for years. He was Hitler's organizer of the German heavy industry for war. After the downfall of the Nazi regime, Dinkelbach not only escaped denazification, but succeeded in freeing from prison all but 4 of the 31 arrested top Nazi officials of the V.S. Parenthetically, there were over 500 top Vereinigte Stahlwerke officials members of the Nazi Party, SS, SA and other Nazi organizations. Dinkelbach was placed, a few months ago, as the head of the iron and steel industry in the British zone and given the former Stahlhaus at Dusseldorf as the new headquarters for the German steel industry. In keeping with the latest modern trends, the Stahlhaus was baptized North Cumberland House—which decidedly symbolizes the real meaning of the British socialization plans. Dinkelbach has been holding meetings with his friends of the steel industry and is now actively engaged setting up the new North German iron and steel control. Also in keeping with the latest trends, Dinkelbach was given to understand by the British that the German stockholders of the steel and iron companies will not lose anything in the reorganization and that he, Dinkelbach, is slated to act as their trustee. These glad tidings were reported at the meeting of the members of the German iron and steel industry, January 17, 1947, by Dinkelbach himself.

Could this be the reason for Britain's inability to remove Hugenberg as the chairman of Vereinigte Stahlwerke?

We must conclude that not much has changed in Germany, except that the British monopolies have succeeded in acquiring through proxies shares of the Ruhr companies. As a result, the prices of Ruhr industrial shares have risen sharply. As a result also, Britain has become the coal dictator of Europe because she controls three-fourths of the coal consumed by Europe before the war.

It took the democratic world 2 years to learn why, way back at the height of World War II, Britain insisted that she alone can understand the Germans and why Britain wanted to carry on its understanding of the Germans by getting the control over Germany's Ruhr.

To be sure, the present Prime Minister of Britain, Clement Attlee, was not in power then, but a few months ago, he was kind enough to provide us with the proper interpretation of the real meaning of Britain's control of the Ruhr. In a speech delivered November 9, 1946, at the Lord Mayor of London's annual dinner, the Labor Prime Minister had this to say regarding the two facets of Germany's problem: "We cannot have a cesspool of cheap, underfed and exploited labor in the middle of Europe, which may bring down our whole standard of life unless we act with great care. Secondly, in doing this, we must preserve our security and that of our Allies. The German industries must never again be allowed to become an arsenal to be used by a new Germany to attack her neighbors or to promote another war, and it is the fine balance that has to be so carefully worked out and the right controls established."

The real meaning of Britain's carefully elaborated plans and new controls over Germany have been unfolding for the past 2 years. We regret to see these plans of the British Government bear the label of the great Labor Party. We would have understood these plans if they had been presented to us as coming directly from the group of bankers and investors who defeated the peace 25 years ago and who placed so much faith

in the revival of the German industry as to invest heavily in Germany.

Apparently, not much has changed since then. The same group of pro-German bankers and investors are still making the British policy toward Germany, although the Labor Party has been in power for 2 years. This group of investors still believes that the best people in Germany are the industrialists and bankers; hence, they prefer dealing directly with them. Hence too, they are opposed to placing the resources of the Ruhr—the real German war arsenal—in the hands of an international authority. And since the United States policy doesn't seem to favor the internationalization of the Ruhr either, it is only fair to conclude that we are gambling again with peace and security.

RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members to the fact that I have today introduced a resolution that would set up a committee to investigate the most vicious, most brazen lobby which has ever operated in Washington, namely, the real-estate lobby.

I would like to know, as a Member of this House, just what part they played in wrecking the rent-control bill. I would like to know what part they played in helping to block the over-all, comprehensive housing program that we should have passed.

A resolution was passed the other day to investigate housing. That is the biggest laugh of the year.

What we need is not to investigate whether or not people need housing—the people know that, Mr. Speaker—but to investigate why we have not made it possible for them to obtain housing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Daily News of Monday, July 21, 1947]

REAL ESTATE LOBBY SCORES GRAND SLAM
(By Ned Brooks)

The real estate lobby's series of successes in Congress has soothed the sting of President Truman's rebuke to it.

A check-up showed today that the "interests" recently denounced by Mr. Truman have scored a grand slam with the Republican-led legislators. They have won all major objectives in the current session.

Top victories of the lobby include passage of the voluntary 15-percent increase, the scrapping of most remaining controls on home building and other construction, the pigeonholing of all measures for public housing and rejection of administration plans for a central housing agency.

In reluctantly signing the rent control bill, Mr. Truman suggested an investigation of the real estate lobby, asserting it was "intolerable" that the interests were blocking action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill. He added that "nothing could be more subversive of representative government" than the lobby's "ruthless disregard of the public welfare."

"ON THE CAPITOL STEPS"

Six weeks before the session began, Boyd Bernard, then president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, told members to "wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents."

On May 12, after the House had passed the bill opening the way for rent increases and repealing most of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, the association notified members:

"We won the first round of rents through the passage of the Wolcott bill. This embodies substantially the program we wanted."

At the same time the association was soliciting its membership for \$5 contributions to conduct "legislative and research work" here in Washington. Officials ridiculed statements that it had a \$10,000,000 fund available for putting over its program, saying its goal of voluntary subscription was only \$59,000.

The Wolcott bill as finally approved carried the 15-percent rent boost for voluntary leases running through 1948, repealed Federal protections against evictions, and freed all new housing from rent ceilings.

It lifted all restraints on nonhousing construction except for amusement and recreational projects and repealed provisions of the Veterans' Housing Act on price limitation, premium payments on scarce materials, channeling of raw materials, and restrictions against "luxury" homes.

All these actions had been urged by the National Association Home Builders at its Chicago convention last February, when Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, author of the combined rent-housing bill, was the principal speaker. Representative WOLCOTT announced at that time he would sponsor the measure.

The law retains veterans' preferences on new homes and keeps the liberalized system of Federal Housing Administration insurance, both of which were favored by the lobby.

Allied with the Home Builders Association and Real Estate Boards in the other campaign for decontrol and other legislation have been the Building Products Institute, National Foundation of Home and Property Owners, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Savings and Loan League, National Apartment Owners Association, Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

MINOR SET-BACK

One minor set-back was Congress' refusal to continue authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to act as a secondary market for loans partly guaranteed by the Government under the GI bill of rights. The Home Builders Association protested the action and a move has started in the Senate to restore the powers.

Under constant fire from the real-estate organizations, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has progressed only as far as approval by the Senate Banking Committee. It is doubtful if the measure will reach a Senate vote this year, and its rejection by the House is conceded. Chief target of the lobby is the provision for Government subsidies to 500,000 homes for low-income families.

A House petition started by Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS (Democrat, California) has failed to produce the signatures necessary to force a vote on the TEW bill.

The House for the second time has rejected a reorganization plan of President Truman calling for a cover-all branch to be known as the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Senate Banking Committee approved the plan by a one-vote margin, but rejection by the Senate is being predicted. Designed to group all agencies dealing with housing under a

single head the plan has been fought actively by the real-estate groups.

The same groups are supporting a bill by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER (Republican, Ohio) to reestablish the Federal Housing Agency and Federal Home Loan Bank Administration as independent units. Both agencies are among those now grouped under the National Housing Agency, which the lobby wants abolished.

FPHA UNDER FIRE

Real-estate spokesmen have appeared in support of a bill by Senators HARRY P. CAIN (Republican, Washington) and RICHARD B. RUSSELL (Democrat, Georgia) to abolish NHA and one of its subsidiaries, Federal Public Housing Authority.

FPHA, which handles public housing built before the war, has been under fire from many sides. Its administrative budget was chopped \$5,000,000 in Congress, and funds available for low-rent subsidies was cut by a like amount. Since the agency might handle any new public-housing program, the real-estate lobby wants it put out of business.

Congress recently cut \$14,500,000 from the \$50,000,000 requested for FPHA's completion of temporary homes for rental to veterans. The Home Builders' Association had opposed the program, saying the units converted from wartime barracks were only shacks.

The Cain-Russell bill proposes to transfer the disposal of surplus war housing from FPHA to the Federal Works Agency. The House has passed a bill by Representative WOLCOTT accomplishing this result. The measure would require that housing worth about \$750,000,000 be sold for cash by the end of 1948, a provision which opponents say would limit sales to real-estate interests with plenty of ready capital or borrowing power.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 176. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1064. An act relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1042. An act to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1116. An act to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1543. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1614. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title I of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim two acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3775. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments;

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

H. R. 4268. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint

resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg townsite, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lauser;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976); and

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 26, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

978. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated Janu-

ary 2, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the intracoastal waterway from the Mississippi River at New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex. (alternate connection with the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Algiers, La.), requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

979. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 27, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Mississippi River at Maiden Rock, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

980. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cox (Coxes) Creek, tributary of Stony Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

981. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of equipment to the Ex-Navy-Army Personnel Boating Club; to the Committee on Armed Services.

982. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting request for withdrawal of the case of Adeline Chagnon Shapiro from those 74 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of July 1, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

983. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

984. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 23, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Clear Fork of the Mohican River, in Richland County, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

985. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pinconning River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

986. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Dunlap Creek and tributaries, Pennsylvania, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

987. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 27, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bunganuc Creek, Maquoit (Maquoite) Bay, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

988. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on flood control on the Missouri River at Bismarck, N. Dak., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House

of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

989. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel to Hog Island, Hingham Bay, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

990. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presented to the Secretary of the Interior by the Bureau of Reclamation of this Department on July 21, 1947, on the Coachella Valley division, All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project, California (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

991. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, relative to the contest of election of Helen Gahagan Douglas (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

992. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the various Government corporations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 317. Resolution providing expenses for the conducting of studies, investigations, and inquiry to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture pursuant to House Resolution 298; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1077).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 303. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 141; without amendment (Rept. No. 1078).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 259. Resolution providing expenses for conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211 of the Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 331. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 295; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 332. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 296; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 333. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1082).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 334. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 335. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by

House Resolution 111; without amendment (Rept. No. 1084).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 264. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document "Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States," and "Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1085).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 207. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1086).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 297. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 293; without amendment (Rept. No. 1087).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 336. Resolution providing additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1088).

Mr. GAMBLE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 339. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 338; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089).

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090).

Mr. LOVE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4236. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 612. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; without amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 221. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; with amendments (Rept.

No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, first session, directing an investigation of domestic shortages of critical nonferrous metals (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to H. R. 18, on Federal barge lines (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4385. A bill to authorize the President of the United States of America to direct the United States Maritime Commission to charter certain vessels to persons not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4386. A bill to authorize the Army engineers to investigate and determine the feasibility of dredging the Colorado River from the Gulf of California to the Imperial Dam, and of constructing such necessary locks and other facilities for the purpose of creating an inland harbor for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4387. A bill to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to effectuate collective-bargaining agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana (by request):

H. R. 4388. A bill to amend section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4389. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to relieve the Legislative Reference Service of the preparation of data in certain cases; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4390. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4391. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4393. A bill to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4394. A bill to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for

various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4396. A bill to limit the pool elevation and the size of dikes for the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4397. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits payable to Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to a quorum in either House of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to reestablish effective price and rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the reparations owed by Finland to the Soviet Union should be satisfied out of funds the Soviet Union owes to the United States under the Lend-Lease Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings held in commemoration of the centennial of the telegraph, May 24, 1944, provided by House Concurrent Resolution 72, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution authorizing international cooperation to raise social-security protection standards for seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress of the United States with respect to admission in the United States of nationals of the Soviet Union and the admission into the Soviet Union of nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. Res. 341. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the real-estate lobby and other pressure groups; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 342. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 341; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 343. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to have printed additional copies of hearings held before a special subcommittee relative to the agricultural and economic problems of the Cotton Belt; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the office of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4398. A bill for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4399. A bill for the relief of James C. Smith, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Doelman and two sons Johannes and Francisus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Louis Esposito, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Ladislao Valda, Elena Valda, and Stefano Valda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

765. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of Twenty-ninth Division Association, Veterans of World Wars I and II, recommending the passage by the Congress of the United States of a National Security Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

766. Also, resolution of Twenty-ninth Division Association, Veterans of World Wars I and II, recommending the enactment by the Congress of the United States of an Inter-American Military Cooperation Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

767. Also, resolution of approving and recommending the adoption by the Congress of the United States of legislation to provide for the universal military training of young men of the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

768. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. W. Waring, secretary, Townsend Club No. 1, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

769. Also, petition of A. M. Keller, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

770. Also, petition of Jose Norat Rodriguez, Ponce, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to disapproval of the bill for an elective governor; to the Committee on Public Lands.

771. Also, petition of Paul Drew, Pittsburgh, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request to amend the armed forces unification bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the following reports were received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, July 17, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the following report on the personnel employed by the Committee on Agriculture, covering the period of January 3, 1947, through June 30, 1947.

CLERICAL

Name	Position	Gross salary	Date of employment
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	\$9,129.12	Jan. 14 to June 30, 1947.
Katherine Wheeler	Assistant clerk	5,392.20	Feb. 1 to June 30, 1947.
Mae Toole	Stenographer	3,805.80	Feb. 4 to June 30, 1947.
Geraldine W. Baker	do	3,212.74	Feb. 1 to June 10, 1947.
Mary Elizabeth Laxton	do	3,323.10	May 1 to June 30, 1947.
Lorraine Adamson	do	3,047.22	June 23 to June 30, 1947.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	\$9,129.12	Jan. 14 to June 30, 1947.
John J. Heimbürger	Research specialist	8,536.56	Jan. 16 to June 30, 1947.
Hugh H. Soper	do	7,022.50	Apr. 7 to June 30, 1947.

Funds appropriated: None.

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,

July 24, 1947.

There is submitted herewith a report showing the name, title, and total salary paid to the members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations as required under the provisions of section 134b of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, for the period beginning January 3, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947.

Committee employee report submitted in compliance with sec. 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1948, for the period Jan. 3, 1947, to June 30, 1947

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
John C. Pugh	Clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	\$10,000.00	\$777.79	\$4,111.11
Do.	Clerk emeritus	Feb. 1 to May 31	10,000.00	3,333.32	
George Y. Harvey	Assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	10,000.00	777.79	4,944.44
Do.	Clerk	Feb. 1 to June 30	10,000.00	4,166.65	
Kenneth Sprinkle	Assistant clerk	Jan. 17 to 31	8,997.45	349.89	4,516.54
Do.	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	10,000.00	4,166.65	
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	8,997.45	689.80	4,438.70
Do.	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	8,997.45	3,748.90	
Arthur Orr	Assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to June 30	8,997.45	4,438.70	4,438.70
Jack K. McFall	do	Jan. 3 to Feb. 18	8,997.45	1,139.57	
Corhal D. Orescan	do	Jan. 3 to 16	8,339.10	324.29	4,423.08
Do.	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,997.45	4,098.79	
Robert E. Lambert	do	Jan. 3 to 16	8,339.10	324.29	4,423.08
Do.	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,997.45	4,098.79	
Robert P. Williams	do	Jan. 3 to 16	7,022.40	273.09	4,071.98
Do.	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,339.10	3,798.89	
Paul M. Wilson	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,339.10	3,289.27	3,289.27
Claude Hobbs, Jr.	do	Feb. 11 to June 30	5,668.08	2,204.24	
Bert J. Skinnard	Clerk-stenographer	Jan. 3 to 16	4,288.68	166.77	2,497.54
Do.	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	5,116.32	2,330.77	
Lawrence C. Miller	do	Jan. 3 to 16	3,461.04	134.50	2,088.31
Do.	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	4,288.68	1,953.72	
Earl C. Silsby	do	Feb. 16 to June 30	2,633.40	987.52	987.52
John D. Cook	do	Feb. 19 to June 30	2,633.40	965.58	
William J. Strachan	Page	Jan. 17 to May 31	2,218.24	993.02	993.02
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger-file clerk	Jan. 3 to June 30	2,881.69	1,424.84	
Richard J. Denney	Clerk-stenographer, substitute	Jan. 10 to June 30	3,461.04	1,643.99	1,643.99
E. S. Plumley	do	Jan. 7 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	1,095.99	
F. D. Plumley	do	May 1 to June 30	3,461.04	576.84	576.84
Dorothy Davis	do	Jan. 8 to June 30	3,461.04	1,663.21	
Jessemine N. Bennett	do	Jan. 7 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	1,095.79	1,095.79
Eleanor L. Fox	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	3,461.04	1,442.10	
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	do	Feb. 2 to June 30	3,461.04	1,432.47	1,432.47
Marjorie H. Van Riper	do	Mar. 1 to June 30	3,461.04	1,153.68	
Veronica Strozak	do	May 15 to June 30	3,461.04	442.23	442.23
Helen H. Kayser	do	Jan. 7 to 31	3,461.04	230.73	
Do.	do	Mar. 1 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	576.84	807.57

Summary: Available at gross rates, \$73,990.89; total gross paid including increased pay authorized by the Federal Employees Pay Acts of 1945 and 1946, \$62,311.39.

Special investigating committee under Appropriations Committee

REGULAR EMPLOYEES

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
Robert E. Lee	Chief investigator	Jan. 3 to 31	\$8,602.44	\$669.06	\$4,417.96
Do.	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	8,997.36	3,748.90	
James J. Kerr	Investigator	do	7,022.40	2,926.00	2,926.00
Harris H. Huston	do	Feb. 13 to June 30	7,022.40	2,691.92	
Harry S. Barger	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	7,022.40	2,926.00	2,926.00
Jay B. Howe	do	Feb. 14 to June 30	7,022.40	2,672.42	
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	Feb. 17 to June 30	4,288.68	1,596.33	1,596.33
Jean E. Morrow	Clerk-stenographer	Feb. 1 to June 30	2,909.28	1,212.20	
Mildred E. Emerson	do	Mar. 10 to June 30	2,633.40	796.96	796.96

PER DIEM EMPLOYEES

Gilbert H. Clee	Investigator	Feb. 14 to Apr. 2	\$15		\$1,002.55
John M. Dunnick	do	Feb. 24 to Mar. 20	15		629.09
Thomas J. Graves	do	Feb. 25 to Mar. 15	15		398.42
Arthur E. Hald	do	Feb. 17 to Apr. 21	15		1,338.05
Thomas J. Quinn	do	Feb. 17 to Mar. 31	15		897.70
Homer E. Seace	do	Feb. 18 to May 16	15		1,799.37
Wilfred H. Sigerson	do	Feb. 24 to June 30	125		3,472.20
U. Howard Friend	do	Mar. 17 to May 3	15		1,004.60
Claude S. Holloway	do	Mar. 17 to May 9	15		794.89
Ronald M. Ketcham	do	Mar. 13 to Apr. 17	15		752.43
A. Rea Long	do	Mar. 3 to May 23	15		1,715.75
William H. Courtney	do	Mar. 13 to 23	15		230.66
Lewis C. Dorweller	do	Mar. 3 to May 5	15		1,342.06
George A. Hewitt	do	Mar. 25 to May 9	15		440.35
J. William Hope	do	Mar. 3 to May 3	15		671.02
Edward A. Krake	do	Mar. 3 to Apr. 17	15		650.06
E. B. Nutt	do	Mar. 27 to Apr. 30	15		733.94
Jacob S. Siedman	do	Mar. 18 to May 5	15		314.55

¹ Per day base (while actually employed).

Special investigating committee under Appropriations Committee—Continued

PER DIEM EMPLOYEES—continued

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
L. H. Sanderman	Investigator	Mar. 25 to Apr. 30	\$115		\$775.88
Charles H. Towns	do.	Mar. 18 to May 3	115		335.52
Clarence L. Turner	do.	Mar. 1 to May 14	115		650.04
Carman G. Blough	do.	Mar. 5 to May 3	115		482.30
C. Oliver Wellington	do.	Mar. 18 to Apr. 3	115		146.78
G. W. Blair	do.	Mar. 18 to Apr. 11	115		356.47
Elmer C. Upton	do.	Mar. 1 to 19 ¹	115		419.38
W. B. Correll	do.	Apr. 24 to June 6	115		918.66
Robert D. Hammer	do.	Apr. 2 to 30	115		608.10
William J. McGlone	do.	Apr. 18 to May 21	115		712.96
Arthur B. Roberts	do.	May 1 to June 11	115		876.73
Virginia S. Kup	Stenographer	May	75.55		169.71
Mary K. Scott	do.	May 1 to 12	75.55		96.97
Janet S. Parrish	do.	May 1 to 15	75.55		121.22

¹ Per day base (while actually employed).

Summary on special investigating committee
 Appropriation for 80th Cong. \$76,204.03
 Expended for salaries 44,096.20
 Expended for travel and expenses 6,196.45
 Total expenditure 50,294.65
 Balance unexpended June 20, 1947 25,909.38
 Very sincerely yours,
 JOHN TABER, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

July 19, 1947.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 134 (b) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, herewith is reported the name, profession, basic and gross salary of each person employed by the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, during the period January 3–June 30, 1947:

Name	Profession	Per annum basic salary	Gross salary from Jan. 3 to June 30, inclusive
Robert H. Harper	Chief Clerk	\$6,500	\$3,954.93
John Russell Blandford	Professional staff	5,800	3,238.10
Clinton B. D. Brown	do.	5,800	3,160.07
Bryce N. Harlow	do.	5,800	3,238.10
Robert W. Smart	do.	5,800	3,238.10
Townsend Hoopes	Assistant clerk	4,300	2,821.30
Agnes H. Johnston	Stenographer	2,500	1,669.50
Bernice Kalinowski	do.	2,400	1,480.55
Rosemary Curry	do.	2,400	1,406.98
James A. Deakins	Assistant clerk	2,000	614.18

No funds having been made available to this committee during the period January 3–June 30, 1947, no such funds have been expended.

Sincerely,

W. G. ANDREWS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
June 30, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, there is herewith reported the names, official capacity, and basic salary of the members of the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee:

Clerical staff:

William J. Hallahan, clerk \$4,500
 Elsie L. Gould, deputy clerk 3,800
 Margaret Park, assistant clerk 2,100

Professional staff:

Orman S. Fink, staff director 5,550
 Respectfully yours,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

July 18, 1947.

As required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the pay rolls for the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives for the first quarter. This covers the expenditures of the committee since there are no special appropriations.

January 1947:

William N. McLeod, Jr. \$449.35
 Mary C. Harrell 233.24
 Gladys E. Quick 219.45

February 1947:

Mabel G. Haller \$694.92
 William N. McLeod, Jr. (clerk to the minority) 585.20
 Ruth Pingley 357.39

March 1947:

Mabel G. Haller 694.92
 William N. McLeod, Jr. (clerk to the minority) 585.20
 Ruth Pingley 357.39
 Parker Jackson (2 months' appointment) 833.33
 Harriett G. Mossburg (temporary) 154.91

As required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the pay rolls for the District of Columbia Committee for the second quarter. This covers the expenditures of the committee since there were no special appropriations until House Resolution 195 became law.

April 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary \$694.92
 William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk 585.20
 Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer 357.39
 Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary) 154.91
 Parker Jackson, tax specialist 833.33
 Ann Elizabeth Coker, stenographer for tax specialist 129.30

May 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary 694.92
 William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk 585.20

May 1947:

Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer \$357.39
 Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary) 154.91
 Parker Jackson, tax specialist 833.33
 Ann Elizabeth Coker, stenographer for tax specialist 242.44
 Clarence Pierce, specialist, home-rule study 592.72

June 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary 694.92
 William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk 585.20
 Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer 357.39
 Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary) 154.91
 Parker Jackson, tax specialist 833.33
 Samuel J. Fusco, statistical tax clerk (temporary) 242.44
 Ann Elizabeth Coker, stenographer, home-rule study 242.44
 Clarence Pierce, specialist, home-rule study 683.95

¹ Charged to Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.² Charged to Home Rule and Reorganization Subcommittee; transferred to voucher pay roll.

Sincerely,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,

July 22, 1947.

Complying with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, I am submitting herewith the names and salaries of the employees of the Committee on Education and Labor, together with the funds expended under our special appropriation. The employees are:

W. Manly Sheppard, Chief Clerk \$10,000.00
 Irving G. McCann, chief counsel, (professional staff) 10,000.00
 F. Albert Reiman, assistant clerk (professional staff) 10,000.00
 Frank S. McArthur, investigator (professional staff) 10,000.00
 Bingham W. Mathias, minority clerk (professional staff) 10,000.00
 Jennie Ward Carter, clerk-stenographer 4,867.92
 Mary Pauline Smith, clerk-stenographer 4,867.92
 Mary Ellen Gilbert, clerk-stenographer 4,867.92
 Myrtle S. Locher, clerk-stenographer 4,867.92
 Frances A. Los, clerk-stenographer (minority) 4,867.92
 Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111:
 Henry A. Bates, investigator \$8,500.00
 Agnes Ainilian, clerk-stenographer 4,867.92

Pursuant to House Resolution 111, the House appropriated \$40,000 for a special investigation of racketeering in labor unions. As of June 30, \$10,808.96 had been spent. Under this resolution three special subcommittees have been appointed, but they have no additional personnel and have not expended any funds other than those recorded herein. Trusting this is the information you desire, I am

Very sincerely yours,

FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS
(January through June 30, 1947)

	Base pay
Carl E. Hoffman, professional.....	\$6,000
William A. Young, professional.....	5,000
Francis T. O'Donnell, professional.....	5,000
Annabell Zue, chief clerk.....	4,000
Martha Crawley, clerk.....	3,500
Betty Henderson, clerk.....	2,600
Delores Fel'Dotto, clerk.....	2,700
Carl H. Monsees (May 7 through July 12), clerical.....	7,000
Mildred Calhoun (2 weeks, professional).....	7,300
Hazel Huffman (Investigator).....	4,620

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA LEGAL ACTIVITIES IN
DEPARTMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS
Total appropriations, \$40,000.

(Expenses—April to July 1, 1947)

Carl E. Hoffman, expenses.....	\$22.08
Francis O'Donnell:	
Expenses.....	38.57
Do.....	35.85
W. J. Bryan Dorn, expenses.....	78.92
Martha Crawley, expenses.....	41.64
Shorthand Service Bureau, reporting.....	381.15
Carl E. Hoffman:	
Transportation and expenses.....	18.00
Expenses.....	18.87
Do.....	30.05
Do.....	93.70
George B. Murphy, expenses.....	79.14
Francis T. O'Donnell, expenses.....	23.90
Samuel C. Travis, expenses.....	66.20
Annabell Zue, postage.....	20.00
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., services.....	24.10
Electronic Engineering Co., Inc., rental.....	60.00
Alderson Reporting Co., reporting.....	150.90
Hazel Huffman, expenses.....	188.23
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.....	7.05
Do.....	16.60
Helen M. Balog, research and stenographic.....	40.00
Total.....	1,434.95

Total remaining, \$38,565.05.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF
THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
July 22, 1947.

The Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, created pursuant to House Resolution 100, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it during

the period from January 3 to June 30, 1947, together with the funds appropriated to and expended by it:

Margaret B. Campbell (resigned June 22), stenographer, gross annual salary.....	\$2,633.40
Edmond J. Donohue, Jr., associate counsel, gross annual salary.....	6,522.05
Edward E. Fine, Jr. (from Apr. 1), investigator, gross annual salary.....	2,467.87
Herbert S. French (Apr. 14 through June 16), special counsel, gross salary per day.....	27.77
Anna-Marie Hugin, stenographer, gross annual salary.....	3,626.56
Blanche M. LeMan (from June 16), gross annual salary.....	3,461.04
Joseph C. Lewis, associate counsel, gross annual salary.....	5,881.88
George V. McDavitt (from Mar. 3), investigator, gross annual salary.....	5,881.88
Winifred A. Meyerson (resigned June 30), stenographer, gross annual salary.....	3,116.19
Paul F. Morrison (from Mar. 24), investigator, gross annual salary.....	5,392.20
George L. Quinn, Jr., associate counsel, gross annual salary.....	6,522.05
Kathryn E. Smith, chief clerk, gross annual salary.....	4,219.71
Elmer B. Solomon (from Mar. 12), consultant, gross salary per day.....	24.92
Charles G. Tomerlin (from Mar. 17), consultant, gross salary per day.....	27.77
Fugh D. Wise, Jr. (resigned June 30), general counsel, gross annual salary.....	9,919.10
Funds appropriated, \$50,000.	
Funds expended, \$36,929.81.	

Sincerely yours,
ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman, Surplus Property Subcommittee.

EXPENDITURES OF PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS
SUBCOMMITTEE
(May 1-Aug. 1, 1947)

Staff as of Aug. 1, 1947:

Coleman Rosenberger, counsel, May 1-July 31, 1947, at \$4,250 per annum gross.....	\$6,012.93
Fritzie P. Manuel, investigator, May 1-July 31, 1947, at \$4,250 per annum gross.....	6,012.93
Clara D. Terry, clerk, May 1-July 31, 1947, at \$3,540 per annum gross.....	5,033.55
Kathleen H. Hart, stenographer, May 19-July 31, 1947, at \$2,090 per annum gross.....	3,033.42

Previous staff members:

Chet E. Sinclair, staff director, May 3-June 16, 1947, at \$5,800 per annum gross.....	8,075.76
Robert L. Zimler, investigator, June 9-July 31, 1947, at \$4,250 per annum gross.....	6,012.93
Regina H. McLean, stenographer, May 12-24, 1947, at \$2,090 per annum gross.....	3,033.42

Expenses:

Stenographically reporting hearings, June 3 and 4, 1947.....	130.00
Supplies, stationery room, May 5-27.....	53.45
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., June 19-25.....	13.63
Balance, June 30, 1947, \$35,338.94.	

GEORGE H. BENDER, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

June 30, 1947

Salaries:

May:

Frank T. Bow, general counsel.....	\$803.55
Oscar Lewis Hume, investigator.....	150.32
Pansy G. Haines, clerk.....	180.61

June:

Frank T. Bow, general counsel.....	803.55
Oscar Lewis Hume, investigator.....	501.07
Pansy G. Haines, clerk.....	225.57

Stationery room:

May: According to statement (which agrees with the records).....

June: According to my records, \$33.25; but the stationery room had an item for mimeograph ink, purchased by Barbara Yeaple, \$1, which makes a total of.....

3 registered letters.....

O. L. Hume, investigator:

June 4, 1947, cash payment for photostating of St. Paul, Minn., newspapers, in connection with the St. Paul Workshop meeting.....

June, Atlantic City, 2 days, at \$6.....

Frank T. Bow, general counsel, June:

Atlantic City, 2 days, at \$6; transportation (use of automobile), 170 miles at \$0.05 a mile, round trip, \$17; taxi fare, \$3.....

Petty cash.....

Gwen Rhys: Stenographic services rendered, June 25.....

Lawrence Sullivan: research.....

Sound Studios, Inc., Washington, D. C., June 16.....

E. F. Engebretson: June 18, witness at hearing.....

Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. statement.....

Alderson Reporting Co.: Following information received over the telephone, by P. G. H., July 22, 1947, no statements having been received at H. O. B., room 535, subcommittee address. The company bookkeeper reports that one statement (for May 28) was sent to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, included with a charge for work done for the latter committee:

Hearing, May 28.....	\$99.00
Hearing, June 18.....	84.90
Hearing, June 20.....	51.60
Hearing, June 16.....	41.70
Total.....	277.20
Total.....	3,439.59

H. Res. 197 authorizes an expenditure of.....\$26,000.00

June 30, 1947: Amount spent to date, or being processed¹----- \$3,439.59

Balance----- 22,560.41

¹ The items herein set forth have been expended or are being processed for payment.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

July 21, 1947.

In accordance with your letter of July 15, I wish to advise that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has neither received nor disbursed any funds during the period January 1 through June 30, 1947.

The present committee personnel is as follows:

William Y. Elliott, staff director. Services provided by Library of Congress.

	Salary per annum
Boyd Crawford, administrative officer-----	\$10,000.00
George Pettee, professional staff member-----	10,000.00
Charles Burton Marshall, professional staff member-----	10,000.00
John Easton, professional staff member-----	10,000.00
June Nigh, clerical staff member-----	4,288.68
Winifred Osborne, clerical staff member-----	5,016.32
Doris Leone, clerical staff member-----	4,288.68
Mabel Henderson, clerical staff member-----	3,047.22

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, July 1, 1947.

In accordance with section 134 (b), rule XII, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the following information is submitted with reference to the name, profession, and total salary of each member of the staff of the Committee on House Administration as of June 30, 1947:

1. Marjorie Savage, clerk; basic salary, \$4,500; gross salary, \$6,357.78.
2. Frank Specht, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Accounts; basic salary, \$4,300; gross salary, \$6,081.90.
3. Jack Watson, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills, Library, Disposition of Executive Papers and Memorials, basic salary, \$4,300; gross salary, \$6,081.90.

4. Irene Gilchrist, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Elections; basic salary, \$2,500; gross salary, \$3,598.98.

5. Gladys Riggs, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Printing; basic salary, \$2,500; gross salary, \$3,598.98.

6. Maureen Sandiford, assistant clerk and stenographer; basic salary, \$2,500; gross salary, \$3,598.98.

7. Dennis A. Lyons, counsel to Subcommittee on Elections; basic salary, \$5,000; gross salary, \$7,022.40.

Sincerely yours,
K. M. LeCOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, July 17, 1947.

In response to your letter of July 15, I have the following to submit under the provisions of section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946:

CLERICAL STAFF

Name	Title	Base salary	Total salary
Elton J. Layton-----	Clerk-----	\$7,500	\$10,000.00
(Mrs.) Marjorie A. Biddle-----	Assistant clerk-----	3,000	4,288.68
Royce Reno-----	do-----	3,000	4,288.68
(Mrs.) Margaret H. Smith-Burns-----	Assistant clerk-stenographer-----	2,820	4,040.38
(Miss) Georgia G. Glasmann-----	do-----	2,820	4,040.38
Roy P. Wilkinson-----	Assistant clerk-----	2,000	2,909.28

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Arlin E. Stockburger-----	Aviation and engineering consultant-----	\$8,000	\$10,000.00
Andrew Stevenson-----	Expert-----	8,000	10,000.00
Kurt Borchardt-----	Professional assistant-----	5,800	8,075.76
Dr. John H. Frederick-----	Consultant-----	5,200	7,285.68

The above information covering the period ending June 30, 1947, is identical with that submitted in my memorandum to you of April 24.

Under House Resolution 163, appropriating \$25,000 for the transportation survey, the following personnel was appointed: (Miss) Pauline E. Mickelsen, clerk-stenographer; base salary, \$2,820; total salary, \$4,040.38.

Also the additional following amounts have been expended from that appropriation:

On a trip the members made to California in connection with the committee's investigation of safety in air navigation:

April 12, 1947, the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles----- \$744.36

Reimbursement to clerk of the committee for expenditures from April 7 to 12, inclusive----- 265.77

To the landing aids experimental station, Arcata, Calif----- 64.54

On a trip the members made June 10 to 12, inclusive, to New York in connection with aviation accidents:

Reimbursement to Congressman

Leonard W. Hall----- \$29.31

Hotel Lexington, New York City----- 123.91

Reimbursement to A. E. Stockburger, member of professional staff----- 20.50

I trust the above information is what you desire.

With kind personal regards, I am
Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Personnel of period January 3 to June 30, 1947

Name of employee	Title	Period of service	Annual rate, base salary	Annual rate, gross salary
Marvin J. Coles-----	Counsel, professional staff-----	Jan. 14 to June 30-----	\$7,440	\$10,000.00
Guy H. LaBounty-----	Investigator, professional staff-----	Feb. 1 to June 30-----	7,440	10,000.00
Elizabeth B. Bedell-----	Chief clerk, clerical staff-----	do-----	4,000	5,688.08
Kathryn H. Cole-----	Clerk, clerical staff-----	do-----	3,300	4,702.50
Mae H. Stewart-----	Assistant clerk, clerical staff-----	do-----	2,400	3,461.64
Marion S. Jensen-----	Clerk, clerical staff-----	May 1 to June 30-----	3,600	5,116.32

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries investigating funds

Amount authorized by H. Res.

87, Feb. 21, 1947----- \$50,000.00

Amount expended January 3 to

June 30, 1947----- 2,203.03

Balance June 30, 1947----- 47,796.97

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

July 15, 1947.

Pursuant to direction contained in section 134 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1946, I submit herewith a list of the employees on the clerical and professional staffs of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, as of July 15, 1947, together with the gross compensation of each employee:

CLERICAL STAFF

Name	Title	Yearly salary
C. Murray Bernhardt-----	Chief clerk-----	\$8,907.45
Velma Smedley-----	Assistant chief clerk-----	8,339.10
Walter M. Besterman-----	Clerk-stenographer-----	4,978.38
Eileen R. Browne-----	do-----	4,080.12
Harriet R. Booker-----	do-----	4,080.12
Frances Christy-----	do-----	3,736.92

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Walter R. Lee-----	Assistant specialst-----	\$7,022.40
--------------------	--------------------------	------------

JULY 25, 1947.

On July 15, 1947, I rendered you a report pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1946. I wish to supplement this report by adding the following item of expenditure:

Moneys expended from January 1-July 26, 1947, from a special appropriation for preparation of new edition of United States Code, \$49,459.54.

Sincerely yours,
EARL C. MICHENER, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,

July 18, 1947.

In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 601, I give you below a report covering funds expended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the period beginning January 3, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947.

	Salary, annual base	Monthly gross	Gross—first quarter			Gross—second quarter		
			January	February	March	April	May	June
George M. Moore, chief counsel.....	\$7,260	\$833.17	-----	\$416.58	\$833.17	\$833.17	\$833.17	\$833.17
Frederick C. Belen, counsel.....	6,000	694.92	-----	640.06	640.06	694.92	694.92	694.92
Luey K. Daley, assistant clerk.....	2,800	334.40	-----	278.67	334.40	334.40	334.40	334.40
Elayne Morelle, stenographer.....	2,500	299.91	-----	239.91	299.91	299.91	299.91	299.91
Dorothy Francisco, stenog- rapher.....	2,400	288.42	-----	67.29	288.42	288.42	288.42	288.42
Margaret Barnes, stenographer.....	2,100	253.93	-----	226.28	242.44	242.44	242.44	253.93

Funds expended under House Resolution 177
Subcommittee investigation trip to Atlanta,
Ga., June 24 to June 29 (inclusive)—two
Congressmen, one counsel:

Travel..... \$92.25
Hotel and incidentals \$179.77 less
\$5.29..... 174.48
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. MOORE,
Chief Counsel.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
July 23, 1947.

Replying to your letters of July 15 and
July 18, and in accordance with the stat-
utes referred to by you, the following is a
list of the names, professions, and total sal-
aries per annum of the staff members of the
Committee on Public Lands, for the period
ending June 30, 1947:

Ernest A. Grant, clerk..... \$7,022.40
Claude E. Ragan, assistant clerk... 5,392.20
Nancy J. Arnold, assistant clerk... 5,392.20
E. Forrest Reeve, assistant clerk... 5,392.20

No money has yet been expended from
the sum appropriated under House Resolu-
tion 94.

This information is as of June 30, 1947,
and it will be noted that no professional staff
members were employed as of that date.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the
Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the
following is a listing of the name, profession,
and total salary of each staff member em-
ployed by the Committee on Public Works:

Joseph H. McGann, Sr., profes-
sional staff member..... \$8,013.06
Robert F. McConnell, majority
clerk..... 5,943.90
Joseph H. McGann, Jr., minority
clerk..... 4,288.68
Mrs. Vera Watts, stenographer-
clerk..... 4,978.38
Elaine H. Jackson, stenographer-
clerk..... 4,978.38
Violet V. Schumacher, stenogra-
pher-clerk..... 4,978.38

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. DONDERO, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with instructions contained
in section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reor-
ganization Act of 1946, I am submitting here-
with the report required:

Name and title:	Total salary
Snader, Lyle O., clerk.....	\$10,000.00
Montgomery, Donald O., as- sistant clerk.....	5,943.96
Shaw, Humphrey Scott, mi- nority clerk.....	5,419.78
Wright, Jane E., stenogra- pher-assistant clerk.....	4,219.71

With kindest personal regards, and all
good wishes for your continued success, I
remain,

Sincerely,
LEO E. ALLEN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN
ACTIVITIES,
July 21, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the
Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the
following is a listing of the name, profession,
and total gross salary of each staff member
employed by the committee from January
22, 1947, and ending on June 30, 1947.

PROFESSIONAL

Robert E. Stripling, chief investi- gator.....	\$4,416.64
Benjamin Mandel, director of re- search.....	2,779.68
Louis J. Russell, investigator.....	3,450.45
Donald T. Appell, investigator.....	2,428.56
	13,075.33

CLERICAL

John W. Carrington, minority clerk.....	\$2,985.22
Anne D. Turner, file chief.....	2,804.99
Rosella A. Purdy, clerk-stenog- rapher.....	1,894.16
Juliette P. Joray, clerk-stenog- rapher.....	1,894.16
Margaret S. Kerwan, clerk-stenog- rapher.....	1,894.16
Gladys A. Slack, clerk-stenog- rapher.....	1,763.10
	13,235.79

In order to cover the further expenses of
conducting the studies and investigations
authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule eleven
incurred by the committee, House Resolution
77 for \$50,000 was approved January 30, 1947,
and House Resolution 152 for \$50,000 on April
2, 1947. Of the \$100,000 appropriated, \$15,-
512.69 has been expended, leaving a balance
of \$84,487.31.

Very truly yours,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
July 17, 1947.

In accordance with your letter dated July
15, I am furnishing the following data con-
cerning the personnel employed by the
Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House
of Representatives:

Name and title:	Gross salary
Karl Standish, chief clerk.....	\$10,000.00
Bessie N. Kenyon, assistant chief clerk.....	6,357.78
Lucile J. Porter, clerk.....	4,288.68
Frances Montanye, clerk.....	4,288.68
Harriet Oliver, clerk.....	4,288.68
George Turner, clerk.....	3,736.92
Casey M. Jones, professional aide.....	10,000.00

Name and title—Continued

Victor C. Cole, professional aide.....	\$10,000.00
Ida Rowan, professional aide.....	8,339.10

Status of fund authorized under House
Resolution 120, passed March 6, 1947, and
House Resolution 136, passed April 2, 1947:
Amount authorized..... \$25,000.00
Expended through June 30 (no
salaries)..... 1,102.35

Balance..... 23,897.65

Very truly yours,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
July 21, 1947.

Pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legisla-
tive Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended
by the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1947,
I wish to report the name, profession, and
total annual salary of each person employed
by the Committee on Ways and Means for
the period beginning January 3 and ending
June 30, 1947, as follows:

CLERICAL STAFF

	Total annual salary
James A. Tawney, lawyer.....	\$3,997.45
T. J. Polski (Schnitz), assistant clerk.....	7,022.45
Don E. Larson, stenographer and accountant.....	3,928.00
Gladys L. Kullberg, stenographer.....	3,792.09
Susan Taylor, stenographer.....	3,792.09
Margie Halsey, stenographer.....	3,185.16
Sam Hardy, messenger.....	2,222.00
Hughlon Green, messenger.....	2,222.00
Harry Parker, retired messenger.....	2,372.00

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Lynn B. Stratton, tax adviser.....	\$10,000.00
Serge Benson, lawyer-economist.....	8,997.45
Charles W. Davis, lawyer.....	8,339.10

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD KNUTSON.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY,
July 21, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the
Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the
following is a listing of the name, profession,
and total salary of each staff member em-
ployed by the Select Committee on News-
print and Paper Supply:

Total appropriation (H. R. 59).....	\$25,000
Total expenditures as of June 30, 1947.....	3,173

Balance as of June 30, 1947..... 21,827
Alyce E. Warren, clerk, base salary, \$2,100;
gross salary, \$3,047.22.

Sidney Freidberg, counsel; contract fee
basis, not to exceed \$3,000 per annum.
Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Chairman, Select Committee on
Newsprint and Paper Supply.

SELECT COMMITTEE
ON SMALL BUSINESS,
July 19, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of the
Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the
following accounting of funds is submitted
for the period March 24, 1947, through June
30, 1947:

	Salary
M. W. Rowell, executive director...	\$2,694.43
Allen W. Maddren, assistant director	2,250.00
J. G. Crost, investigator	1,887.27
Leo Cullinane, investigator-research	1,587.34
Willis J. Ballinger, economic adviser	824.85
Grace F. Purdy, clerk	1,229.89
Arvilla Benson, stenographer	761.79
Gladys Flanagan, stenographer	761.79
Dorothy E. Henry, stenographer	461.90
Willie E. Foristel, stenographer	709.85
C. J. Reynolds, Jr., messenger	555.48
David C. Macdonald, special counsel	25.00
Total	13,749.59

OTHER EXPENDITURES

Transportation, members and staff	\$1,617.93
Travel expenses, members and staff	1,359.43
Reporting service	1,325.24
Telephone	176.08
Telegraph	55.70
Newspapers and periodicals	52.90
Committee library	56.00
Stationery and supplies	184.60
Miscellaneous (stamps, petty cash, etc.)	44.74
Total	4,872.62

Grand total expended..... 18,622.21

Appropriation (H. Res. 18, 80th Cong.)	60,000.00
Total expenditures Mar. 24, 1947, through June 30, 1947	18,622.21

Balance unexpended..... 41,377.79

Respectfully,

WALTER C. FLOESER.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending of our days, we now submit for Thy divine approval the work that has been accomplished in this session. Bless what we have done aright, pardon and overrule what we may have done amiss.

Grant now unto Thy servants home mercies and journeying mercies and a well-earned rest. Let Thy blessing be upon every Member of this body and all who minister to its comfort and efficiency—upon the officers and secretarial staff; upon the reporters who take down every word, for there is not a word in our tongue but lo they record it altogether; upon the doorkeepers, and the page boys who run to and fro at our beck and call; upon the members of the press, and the great cloud of witnesses who crowd the galleries from every quarter of the country.

Now lettest Thou Thy servants depart in peace. The Lord bless you, and keep

you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you, and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up His countenance upon you, and give you peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 25, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MRS. MARTHA TRUMAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, an hour or two ago the President of the United States left Washington for his home in Missouri to be at the bedside of his aged mother, who, as we all know, has been ill for several months. Word has just come that she has passed away. The President was unable to reach her bedside before the end came.

I am sure that I speak for all Senators and for all the people of the country when I say that we deeply mourn the loss of the President's mother and sympathize with him in his bereavement.

It is a rare thing for any American to live to be 94 years of age. It is a rarer thing for any American mother to live to see her son become President of the United States.

The President's mother was one of the finest characters in the history of the United States, one of the finest mothers, one of the most typical mothers it has ever been my good fortune to know anything about. She was plain, simple, honest, sympathetic, and deeply devoted to her family and her country. She lived to a ripe old age than that referred to in the Bible—threescore years and ten—by some 24 years: She was totally unspoiled by the honors which came to her distinguished son, as he himself has been totally unspoiled by those honors. We all, I am sure, feel deeply the President's loss. We feel deeply the loss of so typical an American mother and American woman as was Mrs. Martha Truman. I express, in a prayerful mood, the hope that the end came peacefully, that her memory will always remain verdant among all who knew her or came under her influence, and that her example of simple Americanism, of Christian virtues, may be emulated by all of us who appreciate the value of American life.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure that there is any precedent for my suggestion, but, in response to the words of the minority leader, I should like to suggest that as the Senate's expression of sympathy the Senate send to the President a floral piece, if that suggestion meets with the approval of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that is a very happy suggestion, and I join in the suggestion that a suitable floral piece be sent to Independence, Mo., representing the sympathy of Members of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated

to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 25, 1947:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; and

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers.

On July 26, 1947:

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands; and

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; and

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FLOESER, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. GORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap;

H. R. 2993. An act to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4068. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building